11/8/84 R4800-2A

RANKINGS

Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell released a report this month ranking states on the basis of the resources they allocate to education and the performance of their students as measured by test scores. For the statistical summary:

See Databank on Pages 12 and 13.

AGENDA

Returning for its second session next week—one that will be shortened by political conventions and campaigns—the 98th Congress will find a long list of unresolved education issues, including the fiscal 1985 budget.

See Page 10.

DISCIPLINE

The author of a new study of school discipline suggests that teachers and administrators need to do a lot more talking about rules and enforcement

See Interview on Page 8.

EDUCATION WEEK

American Education's Newspaper of Record Volume III, Number 17 · January 18, 1984

© 1984 Editorial Projects in Education

Schools Joining National Fight Against Child Abuse

By Anne Bridgman

For the second time in as many months, a television dramatization of a serious child-abuse problem has drawn a record number of viewers. Like "Adam," which documented one family's tragedy with a missing child, last week's ABC-TV movie, "Something About Amelia," dramatized a form of child abuse that has been called the last taboo—incest.

The program was watched by an estimated 60 million viewers, according to Jane Paley, director of community relations for the network.

Women's centers and child-abuse organizations, whose hotline telephone numbers were listed locally following the program, were "deluged with calls," Ms. Paley said.

The ABC movie offers the latest piece of evidence that child abuse—a problem of increasing magnitude nationally, health and social-service officials report—has become a topic of serious concern to many Americans.

In 1982, 1.4 million cases of child abuse were reported to child-welfare authorities, according to the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (N.C.C.A.N.), an agency of the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services that coordinates and disseminates information on child abuse and neglect. The number of such cases has risen annually since 1976, when the cen-

Continued on Page 16

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR PREVENTION OF CHILD ABUSE

Urban Districts Found Lagging in Computerized Instruction

By Charlie Euchner

The country's largest city school systems have been innovators in the administrative uses of computers, but urban districts are lagging behind other types of districts in the number of computers available for student use and in the level of instruction offered on the machines, a survey by the Council of Great City Schools has found.

Most of the 32 districts surveyed are spending significantly more money on administrative uses of computers than on classroom applications, although all but three have moved to incorporate educational technology into their curricula, the survey indicated. It also found that responsibility for the administration of computer-training efforts usually is divided among several departments in a district, and that in many districts students are familiarized with computers through exposure to computer-assisted instructional programs rather than in special classes.

The survey, conducted last summer and published recently, is the first comprehensive review of large districts' approaches to educational technology.

The authors of the report—Michael D. Casserly, a legislative and research associate, and Patricia Hamilton, a consultant—interviewed "at length" district officials with primary responsibility for computer use.

They found that urban schools have far fewer computers available for student use than do U. S. schools as a whole. The ratio of students to computers is 863-to-1 in big-city elementary schools and 186-to-1 in urban secondary schools, the survey found. A recent survey by the Center for the Social Organization of Schools at The Johns Hopkins University found that those ratios for all U. S. schools were 183-to-1 and 88-to-1.

A Surprising Difference

"Inner-city kids never have much of anything, but we just thought this would be one area where there would be not so much of a difference," said Mr. Casserly. "What surprised me is that [disparities developed] so fast."

Mr. Casserly said few big-city districts have used federal block-grant money under Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 to finance computer-education programs because they have used the money to comply with desegregation orders. Suburban and rural districts, he said, have used Chapter 2 money extensively to pay for computer-education programs.

He said the disparities suggest a need for federal legislation similar to the so-called "Apple bill," under which computer manufacturers would receive federal tax credits for donating machines to schools. But he said the legislation should include incentives to encourage companies to donate computers to poor school districts. (The Apple bill and other similar such measures

Continued on Page 14

Florida Governor Seeks Swift Action On Rule To Implement Merit-Pay Plan

By Susan Walton

Gov. Robert Graham of Florida, concerned about possible delays in setting up a merit-pay plan for teachers, has asked officials in the State Department of Education to write the rule needed to put the state's new merit-pay law into effect.

The Governor's action means that he is, in effect, circumventing the Florida Quality Instruction Incentives Council, a 15-member body established by the same 1983 law that mandated merit pay. Part of the merit-pay council's responsibility was to develop a rule that would provide mechanisms for implementing the merit-pay law. The rule must be approved by the Florida Board of Education; then any programs it creates are subject to legislative approval.

But although the council approved three plans in concept at a meeting last December, it has not recommended one of them in particular, nor has it provided a funding

Continued on Page 18

Rights-Panel Memo Said Not To Mark Shift in Policy

Staff Director Raises 'Troubling Questions'

By Tom Mirga

WASHINGTON—The staff director of the new U. S. Commission on Civil Rights said last week that the panel's expected reassessment of longstanding policies on remedies for discrimination does not mean it is becoming a "mouthpiece" for the Reagan Administration.

In a Jan. 4 memorandum to the commissioners, the staff director, Linda Chavez, recommended that the panel initiate or continue programs to investigate the possible negative effects of affirmative action, student busing for desegregation purposes, and bilingual education. *(Excerpts from the memorandum appear on page 11.)*

Several major civil-rights organizations have strongly criticized the memo, saying that its adoption would lead to the destruction of 25 years of progress in civil rights.

One of the commission's professional staff members said: "Any hope that the new commission will be independent dies a little bit more every day."

But in an interview last week, Ms. Chavez, an Administration appointee who has been with the panel since August, said that the fact-finding agency "must begin to ask these troubling questions."

"I know that there is a fear among our

Continued on Page 14

Linda Chavez

IN SUMMARY

Closing an Information Gap
A new foundation-sponsored project will provide state policymakers with research and analysis on education issues. **Story on Page 5.**

Full Speed Ahead in Michigan
The state department of education has adopted the most far-reaching education-reform program in its history. **Story on Page 5.**

State of the States
A number of governors urged their legislatures last week to join them in upgrading public education. **Story on Page 6.**

A Vote on Reform Proposals
The Connecticut Board of Education has rejected the commissioner's plan for a longer school year for students. **Story on Page 6.**

'Moving the Nation's Agenda'
State leaders of the N.E.A. meet to learn about lobbying techniques and position strategies for state-level debates. **Story on Page 7.**

Large Agenda, Little Time
In a busy election year, the Congress is returning to confront a number of education initiatives. **Story on Page 10.**

A Setback for the Administration
The U. S. Supreme Court has decided not to review a reverse-discrimination suit in Detroit. **Story on Page 10.**

In Praise of Libraries
Secretary Bell plans a series of seminars to study the role of libraries in the excellence movement. **Story on Page 10.**

Appointments	21	Federal File	14
Commentary	19 and 24	Letters	19
Databank	12 and 13	Marketplace	22
Deaths	21	Publishing Column	20
Events	21	Washington News	10

EDUCATION WEEK (ISSN 0277-4232) is published 42 times per year (weekly except for the first week in January, the last week in June, the month of July, the first two weeks in August, the last week in November, and the last week in December) by Editorial Projects in Education, Incorporated. Editorial and advertising sales offices are located at 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Suite 560, Washington, D.C. 20036. (202) 466-5190. Subscriptions: U.S. and Canada: $39.94 for 42 issues. Foreign: $85.94 (airmail) and $56.44 (surface mail) for 42 issues. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. **POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to EDUCATION WEEK, P.O. Box 1939, Marion, Ohio 43305. Volume III, Issue 17.

Main Editorial and Business Offices

Suite 560, 1333 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 466-5190

Subscription Problems:
Please call Rhonda Sucher
202-466-5190

New Subscriptions
and Changes of Address
Write to:
Post Office Box 1939
Marion, Ohio 43305

EDITOR
Ronald A. Wolk

EXECUTIVE EDITOR
Martha K. Matzke

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
Thomas Toch, Susan Walton

ASSISTANT EDITOR
Tom Mirga

STAFF WRITERS
Hope Aldrich, Anne Bridgman
Cindy Currence, Charlie Euchner,
Susan Foster, Sheppard Ranbom

MIDWESTERN BUREAU
Peggy Caldwell
Midwestern Editorial Office
Cleveland, Ohio
(216) 752-0438

COMMENTARY EDITOR
Alex Heard

SYSTEMS MANAGER
Anne Bridgman

EVENTS EDITOR & COPY EDITOR
Tricia Furniss

ART DIRECTOR
Beth L. Schlenoff

ASSISTANT ART DIRECTOR
Ann Rickerich

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS
Ann Rickerich
Pamela Winston

CIRCULATION MANAGER
Rhonda J. Sucher

ASSISTANT TO PUBLISHER
Jeff Ranbom

PUBLISHING CONSULTANT
Lawrence A. Durocher Jr.

BOOKKEEPER
Lorna Green

STUDENT INTERN
Pamela G. Pitt

DISPLAY ADVERTISING

East Coast and Midwest

Director
Leslie K. Hubbard
Suite 560
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/466-5190

ADVERTISING SALES
REPRESENTATIVE

West Coast, Oklahoma, and Texas

Joe Shere
1507 Bonnie Doone Terrace
Corona del Mar, California 92625
714/640-5689

Grants to help establish *Education Week* have been made by the following philanthropic foundations: Atlantic Richfield Foundation, Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, Cleveland Foundation, Denver Foundation, Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Exxon Education Foundation, Faye McBeath Foundation, Frost Foundation, George Gund Foundation, Hartford Foundation for Public Giving, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Kettering Family Fund, Esther A. and Joseph Klingenstein Fund, Lilly Endowment, William Penn Foundation, Permanent Charities Fund of Boston, Sid W. Richardson Foundation, Rhode Island Foundation, San Francisco Foundation, Shell Companies Foundation, Standard Oil of Ohio, The Tinker Foundation.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES
IN U.S. AND CANADA

One year (42 issues) . . .$39.94. Outside the U. S. and Canada. . .$56.44 per year for surface mail and $85.94 per year for airmail. Send subscription correspondence to: Education Week, P.O. Box 1939, Marion, Ohio 43305.

Back issues are available at $2.00 each (first class postage pre-paid). Send order to: Back Issues, Education Week, Suite 560, 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

THE WEEK

FEDERAL

Calif. Reneges on Civil-Rights Pledge, Groups Tell O.C.R.

Representatives of several civil-rights organizations have asked the U. S. Education Department's office for civil rights to withhold its approval of any future federal vocational-education funds earmarked for California until the state has complied with federal anti-discrimination guidelines.

The request was made in a letter delivered last week to Harry M. Singleton, the department's assistant secretary for civil rights, and signed by representatives from the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, the N.A.A.C.P. Legal Defense and Educational Fund Inc., Equal Rights Advocates Inc., and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund.

Based on documents acquired through the Freedom of Information Act, the organizations contend that the California Department of Education and the Office of the Chancellor of California Community Colleges "have failed to carry out their enforcement plans for eliminating discrimination in vocational education" as required under an agreement reached with federal officials in 1980. The agreement, which is called "methods of administration," calls for annual on-site reviews of grant recipients at the secondary and postsecondary levels and the collection of data on student enrollment and staffing.

In the letter, the organizations asked Mr. Singleton to take "decisive action" against both the education department and the community colleges' leadership by deferring federal vocational funds to force them to comply with the agreement.

The complaining organzations say that if documents in O.C.R.'s possession do not provide an adequate basis for starting enforcement proceedings against the state, "we are requesting that you treat this letter as a complaint" under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Norman J. Chachkin, deputy director of the Lawyers' Committee, said California officials have told the O.C.R. they have been unable to comply with the agreement because of the state's financial problems. But, he noted, "every other state has made an effort to get started" with its compliance agreements.

E.D. Rejects Bond Proposals For Student Loans

Breaking a pattern of routinely approving states' requests for tax-exempt bonds to pay for Guaranteed Student Loans, the U. S. Education Department last month rejected or delayed 23 of 30 applications from states. The applications sought permission for tax-free bond purchases totaling about $2.4 billion.

The department approved tax-free bond measures for only seven of the 30 state applications. Officials rejected four of the applications and demanded more information from states on the other 19 proposals.

According to a department spokesman, the government is reluctant to support the tax-free bonds because it loses revenue from them.

The Congress passed a provision last summer requiring state loan agencies to investigate other sources for funding guaranteed loans besides bonds that lose tax revenue for the government, the spokesman said.

Some observers fear that strict enforcement of the measure will mean that fewer loans will be available.

John Frohlicher, general counsel to the National Council of Higher Education Loan Programs, explained that banks may be reluctant to give out loans if they sense that secondary markets cannot float tax-free bonds to purchase the loans from them.

About one-third of the guaranteed loans, which are now available to students at 8-percent interest, are financed by state loan programs and the remaining two-thirds are financed by the Student Loan Marketing Association (known as "Sallie Mae").

Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell said earlier this month that the loan program will not be threatened by requiring states to seek private lenders before asking the federal government to approve bonds. He said that states could go to the Sallie Mae or to large commercial banks, such as Citibank and Chase Manhattan Bank, to finance many loans.

NATIONAL

Series of Films To Be Sponsored By A.A.A.S.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science last week announced it is producing a $6.7 million mathematics-education film series that will be available to the nation's schools free of charge.

The seven-part film project, entitled "The Challenge of the Unknown," is being funded by a grant from the Phillips Petroleum Company. It is expected to be available to a number of "demonstration schools" by next fall and eventually to reach 20 to 25 million students nationwide each year, officials said.

F. James Rutherford, chief education officer of the A.A.A.S., said the project aims to demonstrate to students "the relevance of mathematics in the real world" and to "build a taste in students for calculation and problem-solving . . . to show people that calculation is not all that fearsome."

The film series is designed to be integrated into existing mathematics curricula in classes from the 5th-grade through the remedial college level. A teaching guide accompanies the series.

The A.A.A.S. plans to notify schools across the country of the films' availability next summer. Schools can order films or videotapes and copy them for future use. "The Challenge of the Unknown" is Phillips Petroleum's third educational film series.

Chiefs Criticize Ranking of States By Test Scores

The Council of Chief State School Officers has criticized as "inappropriate" Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell's use of scores on college-admissions tests to compare the educational performance of the states. *(See Databank on page 12 and Education Week, Jan. 11, 1983.)*

"The Council believes that the chart presented by the Education Department does not take into account an adequate number of factors on which to base conclusions, but the format and presentation of the data clearly invite those who examine the chart to draw conclusions about the relative performance of states in education," said Frank Brouillet, superintendent of public instruction in Washington State and president of the organization.

"The Council respects the intent of the Secretary to bring together information about scholastic achievements and possibly related demographic factors in one place," Mr. Brouillet said.

But he added that "the demographic factors cited by the department may or may not be related to educational achievements, and college-entrance-test scores by themselves are not a fair measure of the educational level of the general population of high-school graduates."

Earlier this month, Secretary Bell, in what he said was an effort to promote school improvement in the nation through "healthy competition," released a report ranking the 50 states and the District of Columbia on the basis of the resources they allocate to education and the performance of their students.

Testing experts and officials of the College Board and the American College Testing program, the sponsors of the two leading college-admissions tests, were also critical of Secretary Bell's use of the scores on such tests to compare the general educational performance of the states.

WASHINGTON

Congress Returns to Education Issues

By Tom Mirga

WASHINGTON—Members of the Congress return here next week to confront an agenda crowded with education items and very little time to deal with them.

According to House and Senate observers, the second session of the 98th Congress could be characterized by more recess time than working days.

Congressional leaders plan to end the session on Oct. 4 in order to give members time to campaign for the Nov. 6 elections. By comparison, the last session of Congress lasted until Nov. 18.

The representatives and senators also will take off practically all of July and August for the Democratic and Republican national conventions.

Chief among Congressional priorities is the passage of a budget for fiscal 1985; work on the budget will begin shortly after President Reagan's Jan. 25 State of the Union address.

Documents from the Office of Management and Budget dated Jan. 3 indicate that the Administration will seek $6.75 billion for major elementary and secondary education programs—about a 3.5-percent increase over fiscal 1984 levels—and $6.35 billion for Guaranteed Student Loans and other college financial-aid programs—about a 1-percent increase over current levels of funding. The President's budget will be released officially on Jan. 30.

Before turning to the budget, however, the House plans to investigate the topic of discipline and order in public schools during hearings on Jan. 23 and 24 before its Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education.

A White House working group officially released a report last week indicating that crime, vandalism, and disorder have been on the rise in the schools during the past five years. Classroom discipline was also the focus of a radio address by Mr. Reagan on Jan. 7 and is expected to figure prominently in his State of the Union speech. *(The text of the President's radio address appears on page 14.)*

On Jan. 25 and 26, the House education subcommittee plans to turn its attention to an Education Department report, released earlier this month, that ranked the states and the District of Columbia on students' performance on college-admission tests, expenditures for education, and other indicators. *(See Databank on page 12 and Education Week, Jan. 11, 1984.)*

Among the other education issues scheduled for consideration:

• **Vocational Education.** The reauthorization of federal vocational-education programs is also likely to receive prompt attention from the Congress, according to House and Senate staff members.

Continued on Page 18

Bell Asks Librarians To Join Quest for Excellence

By Anne Bridgman

WASHINGTON—In an address before representatives of the nation's libraries last week, Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell announced that the Education Department will sponsor a series of seminars to examine, in light of the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, the roles libraries can play in fostering educational excellence.

Praising the role of their profession, the Secretary told some 4,000 librarians attending the midwinter meeting of the American Library Association, "I'm hopeful that 1984 will be a good year for American education—including American libraries as the heart and center."

"This is a great network—the greatest in the world—that we have," he said, referring to the more than 110,000 libraries in the United States. "All of you collectively and individually have made and are making magnificent contributions to preserving, protecting, and advancing the sacred cause of libraries, learning, literacy, and enlightenment in America."

In announcing the "Libraries and Learning Society Seminar Project," which will involve meetings in Berkeley, Boston, Chicago, Dallas, and Washington, D.C., Mr. Bell stressed the need for "interrelationships among libraries" and "the absolute importance of cooperation and networking for the improvement of library and information services."

The seminars, which will take place in February, will be sponsored by the Education Department's Center for Libraries and Education Improvement, an office that was created in a departmental reorganization last year. Participants will hear papers presented by leaders in the field of library science and will discuss the role of libraries in educational improvement, according to Haroldie K. Spriggs, planning and budget coordinator for the center.

Literacy Coalition

Secretary Bell was joined by Barbara Bush, wife of Vice President George Bush. "I have come to cheer librarians," she said, adding, "I have very high hopes for the Coalition for Literacy."

The coalition is a group of 11 national, nonprofit organizations that will work together to help the nation's estimated 23 million functionally illiterate adults. Their project, launched in September, is the first national effort to address the subject, according to A.L.A. officials.

In addition to the A.L.A., which is coordinating the coalition's activities, the organizations involved include the American Association of Advertising Agencies, the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education, B. Dalton Bookseller, CONTACT Inc., the International Reading Association, Laubach Literacy International, Literacy Volunteers of America Inc., the National Advisory Council on Adult Education, the National Commission on Libraries and information Science, and the National Council of State Directors of Adult Education.

Secretary Bell presented the coalition with a $50,000 grant from the Education Department to support a literacy-awareness campaign. As part of the three-year effort, the coalition will use a toll-free telephone number to recruit 50,000 volunteers to serve as managers and tutors in local communities nationwide and to refer callers to local literacy programs and resources. The number is (800) 228-8813.

Also included in the presentation on literacy was a panel, moderated by Brooke Sheldon, president of the A.L.A., on alliances between libraries and community groups. Participants included Elaine Stienkemeyer, president of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers; Dorothy Ridings, president of the League of Women Voters; and James Fowler, president of Lions Club International. The speakers agreed that strong libraries play a major role in raising society's literacy level and symbolizing its commitment to education. And the speakers maintained that the decline in literacy will be reversed only if community groups cooperate on projects to aid illiterate adults.

Excellence Report Response

Also during the A.L.A. meeting, the American Association of School Librarians, in a formal response to the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, argued that school reform depends on vigorous library-resource programs. Library-media specialists, they noted, "have the instructional resources of print and nonprint materials which can bridge the gap between the humanities and science and technology. They possess the competencies which encourage access to knowledge and to a broad scope of opportunities in this information society."

The library-association members voted to name Beverly Cleary's *Dear Mr. Henshaw* (Morrow) as the recipient of the Newbery Medal for the best children's book of 1983. They awarded Alice and Martin Provenson's *The Glorious Flight: Across the Channel With Louis Blériot* (Viking) the Caldecott Medal, which honors the best picture book of the year.

High Court Refuses To Review Detroit Reverse-Bias Lawsuit

By Tom Mirga

WASHINGTON—The U. S. Supreme Court, in a setback for the Reagan Administration, announced last week that it will not review a controversial "reverse-discrimination" lawsuit involving the Detroit Police Department.

Without comment, the Justices let stand lower-court rulings upholding the police department's voluntary practice of promoting equal numbers of black and white sergeants to lieutenant. The practice has been planned to continue until 1990, when the proportion of black lieutenants is expected to reflect the proportion of blacks residing in the city. The suit, *Bratton* v. *City of Detroit* (Case No. 83-551), was filed in November 1975 by five white sergeants who claimed the department passed them over for promotion in favor of less-qualified black applicants.

Educators have been closely watching the *Bratton* case and others like it because their outcomes could affect the legal standing of affirmative-action plans for teachers and other school personnel.

The Justices heard oral arguments in a similar reverse-discrimination case, *Stotts* v. *Memphis Fire Department* (No. 82-229), early last month. *(See Education Week, Dec. 14, 1983.)* A decision in that case, in which the Court has been asked to rule on the legality of layoff policies that seek to preserve racial balance, is expected by late spring or early summer.

Last month, the Justice Department filed a brief with the Court in the *Bratton* case, saying it had "profound doubts" whether the Constitution allows governments to adopt racial quotas to remedy past discrimination in hiring, particularly when those quotas supersede long-established merit-promotion systems.

Furthermore, the department said it doubts that the Constitution protects remedial actions that benefit people who are not the actual victims of discrimination, but only members of a class that historically has been discriminated against.

"This case presents an appropriate occasion for the Court to attempt to reach some consensus on the proper approach to cases involving the adoption by the government of quotas for employment," Solicitor General Rex E. Lee unsuccessfully argued in the Administration's brief.

Other Action

In other action last week, the Court refused to review a lower-court decision that could result in salary adjustments for a mathematics instructor at a Texas junior college.

The suit, *Laredo Junior College* v. *Perez* (No. 83-701), was filed by the instructor in January 1982 because college officials had refused to grant him additional compensation after he obtained a doctoral degree in educational administration.

According to papers filed with the Court, the college's pay policies reward instructors with salary increases if they earn degrees in their teaching field. The college said that because Mr. Perez's degree was not in mathematics, he was not entitled to a raise. Mr. Perez, however, contended that college officials routinely made exceptions to the policy.

The federal district judge hearing the case ruled in favor of the college, saying that Mr. Perez filed his suit more than a year after the state statute of limitations on his claim had expired.

Court Reversed Decision

But on appeal, the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit reversed that decision. The court said that because other faculty members have been compensated for doctoral degrees outside their teaching areas, Mr. Perez has been the victim of a continuing denial of equal protection and the statute of limitations does not apply.

The case now returns to the federal district court for a rehearing based on the appeals court's decision.

Also last week, the Court heard oral arguments in a case that calls into question at-large elections in areas with concentrated minority populations.

The lawsuit, *Escambia County, Fla.* v. *McMillan* (No. 82-1295), was filed in 1977 as a class action on behalf of blacks in the county who claimed that the county's at-large election scheme improperly diluted their votes and thus violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment.

Last month, the Justices upheld a federal appeals court's decision that at-large elections for the school board in Mobile County, Ala., violated the civil rights of black residents. *(See Education Week, Dec. 14, 1983.)*

Escambia County voters elect their five-member board of commissioners on an at-large basis. Under this system, candidates run for numbered places corresponding to the areas where they live, but each must be elected by voters of the entire county.

Although blacks make up 17 percent of the registered voters in the county, none of the four blacks who have run for the county commission has been elected.

Federal district and appeals courts have rejected the at-large voting system and ordered the county to establish a ward system for electing its commissioners. The Escambia County Commission appealed these decisions to the Justices, maintaining that it instituted the at-large election scheme for reasons of "good government," not racial discrimination.

The Court is expected to reach a decision in the case by late spring.

Notes

The chart on page 12 compares the student performance, education resources, and some demographic characteristics of the 50 states and the District of Columbia. It was compiled by the Education Department and was released by Secretary Terrel H. Bell in Washington earlier this month.

The sources of the information in the chart include the state departments of education, the National Center for Education Statistics, the Educational Testing Service, the Census Bureau, the U. S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, the U. S. Office of Civil Rights, and the Department of Education.

Excerpts From the Chavez Memorandum to the Civil-Rights Commission

Following are excerpts directly related to education from the Jan. 4 memorandum prepared by Staff Director Linda Chavez for the U. S. Commmission on Civil Rights.

Memorandum
To Commissioners

From: Linda Chavez
Subject: Program Recommendations For FY 1984

Programs for 1984 and 1985 were previously adopted by the Civil Rights Commission at its 1983 planning meeting. The new commission, however, must decide which of the larger-scale projects to continue and in what form and which new projects to initiate. Following is a brief summary of each approved FY 1984 project and my recommendation for commission action. I have also included a few items that you may want to consider as new projects. A detailed discussion of the program for 1984 and new initiatives will occupy most of Monday's agenda.

For those of you new to the commission, projects generally take the form of hearings, written reports, or consultations. Reports can be researched and written by commission staff or by outside contractors. Formal hearings, which include the issuance of subpoenas and the use of sworn testimony, entail temporary assignment of staff to the hearing location for a period of four to six weeks and are usually followed by the issuance of a commission report with or without recommendations. Consultations allow commissioners to hear the views of experts and scholars in a given field who present papers that are later published by the commission. Commission reports or projects on critical issues sometimes follow such consultations. While the commission may decide new formats for its work, these have proved useful in the past.

. . .

2. Use of Voluntary Methods of Achieving School Desegregation

The commission's past policy has been to endorse mandatory busing to achieve desegregation. The new commission may wish to reassess this policy, and a study on voluntary desegregation could set the stage for such action. As currently planned, the project would include a literature review and on-site visits by staff. Voluntary desegregation can encompass busing as well as such alternatives as magnet schools, open enrollment, special attendance schools, and other methods.

Recommendation: The commission can conduct a study to review desegregation of elementary and secondary schools in order to ascertain which techniques actually promote or achieve integration, for how long, and with what other effects on the communities involved. The study would include a literature review and would concentrate on selected city experiences with possible on-site visits by project staff. . . .

6. Student Financial Assistance

As presently conceived, this project would study the effects of reduction in student aid on predominantly minority institutions. Six predominantly black colleges and three predominantly Hispanic are the focus of the study. Inherent in the design of this project is an assumption that equal educational opportunity does not simply entail non-discrimination in college admissions. Some affirmative responsibility on the part of the federal government to make college affordable to minority students is also envisioned as part of the equal opportunity responsibility.

Recommendation: The commission cancel this project. The jurisdiction of the commission is to study discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, and handicap. Unless the commission wishes to establish that federal student-financial aid is a civil right guaranteed to members of minority groups, this project would appear clearly beyond our jurisdiction.

7. Segregation of Hispanic Students

Several studies in the last year have noted increasing isolation of Hispanic students in public schools. Despite data that suggest that Hispanic students are more isolated in schools today than they were in 1968, little has been written that identifies the reasons for this growing phenomenon. The commission had planned to conduct a study consisting of a literature review and an analysis of the possible causes of this ethnic isolation. In addition, a field study of selected sites would be undertaken and a report issued.

Recommendation: Initiate the commission study with a one-day consultation in a city with high Hispanic concentration. Special emphasis should be paid in the design of the project to the possible role of programs such as bilingual education in the increasing isolation of Hispanics, particularly within schools.

. . .

10. State and Local Civil-Rights Enforcement

This project would assess the role of state agencies with civil-rights responsibilities in the enforcement of civil rights protected under federal laws. The resulting report would evaluate the states' enforcement efforts and, based on this evaluation, would make recommendations to the Executive and Congress on what the future role of these agencies should be.

Recommendation: The commission not commit itself to such an ambitious project without a preliminary feasibility study. A more limited project that still addresses the general concern of this program may be more feasible. . . .

12. Social Indicators Report

The old commission planned to update in 1984 the Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women Report, which was published in 1978. The original study examined the rate of progress of various groups on a range of indices of "quality of life," including educational achievement, employment, and median income.

The underlying assumption was that equality of opportunity would naturally translate itself into equal-

Continued on Page 18

IN FEDERAL AGENCIES

Accrediting agencies. The Education Department published, in the Jan. 10 *Federal Register*, a list of accrediting agencies and associations that the Secretary of Education recognizes as reliable authorities on the quality of training at educational institutions or the programs they accredit. Contact: Barbara Binker, Agency Evaluation Section, Eligibility and Agency Evaluation Staff, Office of Postsecondary Education, Room 3522, ROB-3, E.D., 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

Desegregation. The Education Department announced, in the Dec. 20 *Federal Register*, a Feb. 21 application closing date for new projects under the state educational-agency and desegregation-assistance programs. The awards will assist school districts that have educational problems caused by desegregation based on race, sex, and national origin. Authority for the program is contained in Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The projects will provide technical assistance, training, and advisory services to school districts. Contact: Curtis F. Coates, Section Chief, Equity Training and Technical Assistance Program Staff, Room 2011, FOB-6, E.D., 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202; (202) 245-7965.

Handicapped children. The Education Department published, in the Dec. 15 *Federal Register*, a correction to information published in the Nov. 9 *Federal Register* for new grant applications under the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program. The estimate of available funds should be changed to $3,000,000 and the anticipated number of new programs should read 30. Contact: Jane DeWeerd, Program Development Branch, Special Education Programs, Donohoe Building, Room 4046, E.D., 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202; (202) 245-9405.

Indian education. The Education Department announced, in the Jan. 6 *Federal Register*, a closed meeting of the Search Committee of the National Advisory Council on Indian Education on Jan. 19-20 in Washington. The committee will review candidates for the position of director of Indian Education Programs. Contact: Lincoln C. White, Executive Director, National Advisory Council on Indian Education, 425 13th Street, N.W., Suite 326, Washington, D.C. 20004; (202) 376-8882.

Juvenile delinquency. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice announced, in the Jan. 4 *Federal Register*, a new program for the evaluation of the Habitual Serious and Violent Juvenile Offender and Operation Hardcore programs. The O.J.J.D.P.'s National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention invites public and private agencies to apply for grants to help them design and implement evaluation programs. Applications should be sent to: Barbara Tatem Kelley, NIJJDP/OJJDP, Room 700, Justice Department, 633 Indiana Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531.

Juvenile Delinquency. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Justice Department announced, in the Jan. 6 *Federal Register*, that it is sponsoring a new correctional program for chronic, serious juvenile offenders that involves the private sector. Profit and non-profit organizations are invited to submit pre-applications verifying their ability to manage an experimental correctional program and outlining their proposed approach. Applications must be sent by Feb. 10 to O.J.J.D.P., 633 Indiana Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531.

National Diffusion Network regulations. The Education Department published, in the Dec. 27 *Federal Register*, proposed revisions to the National Diffusion Network regulations. The changes would be part of the Education Department's effort to deregulate and improve the operation of the program. The National Diffusion Network was established in 1974 to promote exemplary educational programs. Comments on the proposed revisions must be received by Feb. 10. Contact: Lois N. Weinberg, Education Program Specialist, National Diffusion Network, Room 613, Brown Building, E.D., 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202; (202) 653-7006.

Overseas dependents' education. The Education Department announced, in the Jan. 11 *Federal Register*, a meeting of the Advisory Council on Dependent's Education and related committees on Feb. 6-8. The council meeting will be held Feb. 6 and Feb. 8 from 9 A.M. to 5 P.M. in the Dogwood Rooms A and B of the Rosslyn Westpark Hotel at 1900 N. Fort Myer Dr. in Rosslyn, Va. The committee meetings will be held Feb. 7 from 9 A.M. to 4 P.M. in the same rooms. Contact: William F. Keough, Administrator of Education for Oversees Dependents, Room 2083, E.D., 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202; (202) 245-8011.

Footnotes

Following are the footnotes for the Databank that appears on pages 12-13.

[1] Performance data are provided for 1972 (the 1971–72 school year) and 1982 (1981–82 school year). Resource inputs and population characteristics data are also shown for 1972 and 1982, when available. Otherwise, the most recently available information is used.

[2] States appear in one of the two test groups—that of the American College Test (ACT) or the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) depending upon which test is taken by most college-bound high-school seniors in the state, except for Washington state. Washington state is not included because fewer than 20 percent of its high-school seniors took either the ACT or or SAT. All states except Nebraska remained in the same test group from 1972–1982. (In Nebraska in 1972 more college-bound high-school seniors took the SAT than the ACT, but the 1972 Nebraska ACT score is reported in the table because it was an ACT state in 1982. The 1972 SAT score for Nebraska was 956 and its 1972 SAT rank was 3.)

[3] Explanations of rankings: In cases of ties in rankings, the average rank is used (e.g., two states tieing for second rank are listed as 2.5; three states tieing for second rank are each listed as 3.

[4] ACT states' "ranking" of "score changes" go from states having least (1) to greatest (28) score decline; SAT states are ranked from highest gain (1) to most decline (22). Only the District of Columbia had a score gain between 1972 and 1982 (see columns 5 and 10).

[5] Includes programs where the state allocates funds to school districts for "remedial instruction" or where the state provides "extra revenues to school districts in recognition of high concentrations of educationally or economically disadvantaged students" (Education Commission of the States, 1982).

[6] Washington state performance scores are not included in the table because fewer than 60 percent of its high school seniors took either the ACT or SAT.

FOR THE RECORD

Following is the text of the President's Jan. 7 radio address.

My fellow Americans, this is my first radio talk in 1984, so happy new year.

My prayer for you this new year is that you and your families will prosper in health and happiness. When I spoke to you last Saturday on New Year's Eve, I made one request to everyone: When we drive, let's drive sober. Well, I was delighted to hear some very heartening news from Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Dole. Last New Year's weekend was the safest on our highways in 35 years. Our efforts to keep drunk, violent drivers off the road are beginning to show progress.

Today I want to talk about a subject . . . [that] is on our minds as the holidays end and our children go back to school: the problem of classroom discipline. The sad truth is, many classrooms across the country are not temples of learning, teaching the lessons of good will, civility, and wisdom important to the whole fabric of American life. Many schools are filled with rude, unruly behavior and even violence.

According to a 1978 report by the National Institute of Education, each month 3 million secondary schoolchildren were victims of in-school crime. I don't mean ordinary high-jinks. I mean crime. Each month some 2.5 million students were the victims of robberies and thefts, and more than 250,000 students suffered physical attacks. In large cities, the problem was so bad that almost 8 percent of urban junior- and senior-high-school students missed at least one day in the classroom per month because they were afraid to go to school.

Now maybe you're thinking: That was back in 1978. Well, a study released in 1983 indicates this 1978 report probably understates the problem today.

Just as school violence affects our sons and daughters, it also affects their teachers. That 1978 National Institute of Education study found that each month some 6,000 teachers were robbed, about 125,000 a month were threatened with physical harm, and at least 1,000 teachers each month were assaulted with violence so severe that they required medical care. One psychiatrist who treats teachers says many of them suffer symptoms identical to those of World War I shell-shock victims. It's that bad.

Today, American children need good education more than ever. But we can't get learning back into our schools until we get the crime and violence out. It's not a question of anyone asking for a police state. It's just that—as Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers put it—"We're not going to get people interested in English or mathematics or social studies and languages, unless we solve discipline problems and take out of our schools those students who prevent teachers from teaching."

Today, I'm asking Americans to renew our commitment to school discipline. Here at the national level, we're directing the federal government to do all it can to help parents, teachers, and administrators restore order to their classrooms.

The Department of Education will study ways to prevent school violence; publicize examples of effective school discipline, continue its joint project with the National Institute of Justice to find better ways for localities to use their resources to prevent school crime.

The Department of Justice will establish a National School Safety Center. This Center will publish handbooks informing teachers and other officials of their legal rights in dealing with disruptive students, and put together a computerized national clearinghouse for school safety resources. I've also directed the Justice Department to file court briefs to help school administrators enforce school discipline.

But, despite the importance of these efforts, we can't make progress without help from superintendents and principals, teachers, parents, and students themselves.

I wish I could tell you all the stories I've heard of schools that have been turned around by determined local efforts. At Southwestern High in Detroit, once one of the city's most violent schools, firm discipline has raised the attendance rate from 53 to almost 87 percent.

In my home state of California at Sacramento's El Camino High, a discipline compact between parents and the school has helped achievement levels soar. And in the Watts section of Los Angeles, George Washington Preparatory High School recently established a policy of strict discipline with impressive results. Just five years ago, only 43 percent of the school's seniors expressed an interest in going to college. Well, last year, 80 percent of the seniors did go to college.

So please—if you have discipline problems at your school—find out what you can do to help. By working together, we can restore good order to America's classrooms and give our sons and daughters the education they deserve.

DATABANK

State Education Statistics

PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES[2]

See notes on pages 10 and 11.

State and year		ACT (scores for 28 states) ACT score (1)	ACT Rank[3] out of 28 (2)	ACT % of h.s. seniors taking test (3)	ACT Score change 1972-82 (4)	ACT Ranking of score change[4] (out of 28) (5)	SAT (scores for 22 states) SAT score (6)	SAT Rank[3] out of 22 (7)	SAT %of h.s. seniors taking test (8)	SAT Score change 1972-82 (9)	SAT Ranking of score change (out of 22) (10)	Graduation rate % (11)	Graduation rate Rank[3] out of 51 (12)	Pupil/teacher ratio pupils/ teacher (13)	Pupil/teacher ratio Rank[3] out of 51 (14)	Average teacher salary Salary ($) (15)
Alabama	1982	17.2	26.0	55.2	-1.1	16.0	–	–	–	–	–	67.1	43.0	20.7	43.0	15,413
	1972	18.3	25.5	49.6	–	–	–	–	–	–		65.4	48.0	23.9	42.0	7,737
Alaska	1982	18.7	13.5	31.4	-0.9	10.0	–	–	–	–	–	71.0	38.0	16.0	8.5	29,000
	1972	19.6	15.5	33.6	–	–	–	–	–	–		79.3	25.0	21.0	18.0	14,124
Arizona	1982	18.7	13.5	41.2	-0.6	4.0	–	–	–	–	–	72.4	33.0	19.8	37.0	17,359
	1972	19.3	17.5	55.5	–	–	–	–	–	–		73.8	37.0	22.2	25.5	10,136
Arkansas	1982	17.7	20.0	56.3	-0.9	10.0	–	–	–	–	–	74.7	30.0	18.6	29.0	13,270
	1972	18.6	22.0	40.4	–	–	–	–	–	–		68.9	45.0	23.4	40.5	7,021
California	1982	–	–	–	–	–	899	4.0	38.4	-58.0	20.0	68.9	39.0	23.1	50.0	19,648
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	957	2.0	31.6	–	–	79.9	22.0	24.1	43.0	11,300
Colorado	1982	19.6	5.0	66.7	-0.3	1.5	–	–	–	–	–	76.3	22.0	18.7	30.0	17,734
	1972	19.9	11.5	50.2	–	–	–	–	–	–		84.8	9.0	22.5	31.5	9,068
Connecticut	1982	–	–	–	–	–	896	6.5	69.0	-49.0	16.0	71.2	37.0	15.0	1.5	17,440
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	945	4.0	70.7	–	–	83.4	12.0	19.4	5.0	10,079
Delaware	1982	–	–	–	–	–	897	5.0	49.3	-46.0	11.5	81.8	9.0	17.8	22.5	18,025
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	943	5.0	57.2	–	–	78.0	29.0	22.3	28.0	10,211
District of Columbia	1982	–	–	–	–	–	821	21.0	53.4	18.0	1.0	55.8	50.0	18.5	27.0	22,883
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	803	22.0	66.2	–	–	54.8	51.0	21.2	20.0	11,022
Florida	1982	–	–	–	–	–	889	9.5	37.5	-52.0	18.0	65.4	46.0	19.9	38.5	15,563
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	941	6.0	26.8	–	–	72.1	39.0	22.7	34.0	9,020
Georgia	1982	–	–	–	–	–	823	20.0	49.0	-11.0	2.0	–	–	18.8	31.5	15,444
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	834	20.0	55.0	–	–	64.8	49.0	25.2	50.0	7,710
Hawaii	1982	–	–	–	–	–	857	18.0	47.3	-64.0	22.0	84.2	4.0	22.7	48.0	20,993
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	921	14.5	52.9	–	–	89.1	4.0	22.3	28.0	10,523
Idaho	1982	18.9	10.5	55.3	-1.0	13.0	–	–	–	–	–	76.9	19.0	20.9	45.0	15,146
	1972	19.9	11.5	45.2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	84.7	10.0	22.6	33.0	7,392
Illinois	1982	18.6	16.0	67.4	-1.2	18.5	–	–	–	–	–	74.8	28.0	18.5	27.0	19,518
	1972	19.8	13.0	62.1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	78.0	28.0	22.5	31.5	10,682
Indiana	1982	–	–	–	–	–	860	17.0	47.0	-46.0	11.5	76.9	21.0	20.0	40.0	16,876
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	906	18.0	50.4	–	–	76.1	34.0	24.6	45.5	9,605
Iowa	1982	20.3	2.0	54.6	-1.7	27.0	–	–	–	–	–	85.8	3.0	16.5	11.5	16,150
	1972	22.0	1.0	49.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	89.5	3.0	20.2	11.5	9,638
Kansas	1982	18.9	10.5	60.8	-1.1	16.0	–	–	–	–	–	80.9	11.0	15.7	4.5	15,250
	1972	20.0	9.5	55.2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	82.8	15.0	19.8	8.0	8,254
Kentucky	1982	17.5	23.5	53.7	-0.9	10.0	–	–	–	–	–	66.9	44.0	20.8	44.0	15,580
	1972	18.4	23.5	45.1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	70.4	42.0	23.2	37.0	7,444
Louisiana	1982	16.7	27.0	60.8	-1.3	20.5	–	–	–	–	–	64.0	48.0	19.6	35.0	14,900
	1972	18.0	27.0	56.7	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	66.5	47.0	22.4	30.0	8,849
Maine	1982	–	–	–	–	–	890	8.0	46.5	-41.0	8.5	72.1	34.0	18.0	24.0	13,984
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	931	11.0	44.2	–	–	80.9	18.0	22.2	25.5	8,750
Maryland	1982	–	–	–	–	–	889	9.5	50.3	-47.0	14.0	75.6	24.0	18.5	27.0	19,286
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	936	8.0	51.4	–	–	80.2	21.0	22.1	24.0	10,463
Massachusetts	1982	–	–	–	–	–	886	11.5	65.6	-45.0	10.0	75.9	23.0	16.0	8.5	18,286
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	933	10.0	68.2	–	–	77.9	30.0	21.2	20.0	8,200
Michigan	1982	18.7	13.5	51.4	-0.4	3.0	–	–	–	–	–	72.7	32.0	22.9	49.0	21,057
	1972	19.1	19.0	24.4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	81.0	17.0	24.8	48.0	11,300
Minnesota	1982	20.2	3.0	26.9	-1.2	18.5	–	–	–	–	–	89.2	1.0	17.1	16.0	17,182
	1972	21.4	2.0	44.3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	91.5	1.0	20.8	17.0	10,266
Mississippi	1982	15.5	28.0	74.5	-0.8	7.0	–	–	–	–	–	63.0	49.0	19.3	34.0	13,000
	1972	16.3	28.0	76.5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	57.6	50.0	23.1	36.0	6,520
Missouri	1982	18.7	13.5	45.2	-1.4	23.0	–	–	–	–	–	75.4	25.0	17.0	15.0	15,422
	1972	20.1	8.0	21.1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	77.5	31.0	22.3	28.0	8,805
Montana	1982	19.5	6.0	49.3	-1.6	26.0	–	–	–	–	–	82.2	8.0	16.5	11.5	15,967
	1972	21.1	3.0	46.5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	79.0	27.0	21.2	20.0	–
Nebraska	1982	19.9	4.0	72.8	-0.7	5.0	–	–	–	–	–	83.6	6.0	15.7	4.5	14,675
	1972	20.6	6.0	27.1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	85.9	7.0	19.9	9.5	7,681
Nevada	1982	18.3	18.0	44.5	-1.0	13.0	–	–	–	–	–	75.3	26.0	21.1	46.0	17,700
	1972	19.3	17.5	51.3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	75.0	35.0	24.6	45.5	10,200
New Hampshire	1982	–	–	–	–	–	925	1.0	56.2	-47.0	14.0	76.3	13.0	16.8	13.5	13,240
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	972	1.0	52.1	–	–	80.7	19.0	20.6	14.5	6,685
New Jersey	1982	–	–	–	–	–	869	15.0	64.7	-47.0	14.0	78.1	15.0	15.9	7.0	18,300
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	916	17.0	71.3	–	–	79.7	23.0	19.6	6.5	9,500
New Mexico	1982	17.6	21.5	56.6	-0.8	7.0	–	–	–	–	–	71.6	36.0	18.8	31.5	16,948
	1972	18.4	23.5	51.2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	76.9	32.0	23.3	38.5	8,486
New York	1982	–	–	–	–	–	896	6.5	61.6	-59.0	21.0	66.3	45.0	17.6	21.0	20,400
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	955	3.0	60.2	–	–	74.7	36.0	19.3	4.0	11,400
North Carolina	1982	–	–	–	–	–	827	19.0	46.6	-22.0	3.0	68.4	41.0	19.9	38.5	15,858
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	849	19.0	47.4	–	–	68.6	46.0	23.3	38.5	8,163
North Dakota	1982	17.8	19.0	64.6	-1.8	28.0	–	–	–	–	–	87.3	2.0	16.8	13.5	14,881
	1972	19.6	15.5	67.3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	89.0	6.0	19.9	9.5	7,386
Ohio	1982	19.0	9.0	49.2	-1.0	13.0	–	–	–	–	–	77.5	18.0	19.7	36.0	16,200
	1972	20.0	9.5	35.2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	80.3	20.0	24.4	44.0	9,050
Oklahoma	1982	17.6	21.5	51.4	-1.1	16.0	–	–	–	–	–	77.6	17.0	17.2	17.5	14,640
	1972	18.7	21.0	58.5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	79.3	24.0	23.0	35.0	7,900
Oregon	1982	–	–	–	–	–	908	2.0	41.7	-30.0	4.0	71.7	35.0	20.3	41.0	16,509
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	938	7.0	39.8	–	–	79.2	26.0	20.7	18.0	9,486
Pennsylvania	1982	–	–	–	–	–	885	13.0	51.4	-41.0	8.5	78.8	12.0	17.3	19.5	17,890
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	926	13.0	55.2	–	–	85.0	8.0	21.6	22.0	9,900
Rhode Island	1982	–	–	–	–	–	877	14.0	60.7	-50.0	17.0	72.9	31.0	16.1	10.0	19,902
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	927	12.0	59.6	–	–	81.1	16.0	20.6	14.5	10,000
South Carolina	1982	–	–	–	–	–	790	22.0	49.2	-33.0	7.0	64.3	47.0	19.0	33.0	14,106
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	823	21.0	50.0	–	–	69.2	44.0	20.2	11.5	7,300
South Dakota	1982	19.1	8.0	61.9	-1.5	25.0	–	–	–	–	–	83.9	5.0	15.8	6.0	13,836
	1972	20.6	6.0	55.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	90.5	2.0	18.7	3.0	7,757
Tennessee	1982	17.5	23.5	56.3	-0.8	7.0	–	–	–	–	–	68.9	40.0	20.5	42.0	14,073
	1972	18.3	25.5	52.8	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	72.4	38.0	24.7	47.0	7,970
Texas	1982	–	–	–	–	–	866	16.0	32.4	-53.0	19.0	68.2	42.0	18.4	25.0	15,715
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	921	14.5	32.2	–	–	70.2	43.0	22.6	23.0	8,378
Utah	1982	18.4	17.0	66.4	-1.3	20.5	–	–	–	–	–	81.4	10.0	27.4	51.0	16,612
	1972	19.7	14.0	62.5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	83.3	13.0	25.3	51.0	8,538
Vermont	1982	–	–	–	–	–	904	3.0	54.3	-31.0	5.5	77.7	16.0	15.3	3.0	13,235
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	935	9.0	50.5	–	–	70.9	41.0	17.1	1.0	8,868
Virginia	1982	–	–	–	–	–	868	11.5	51.0	-31.0	5.5	75.0	27.0	17.8	22.5	14,649
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	919	16.0	54.3	–	–	76.4	33.0	20.5	13.0	9,100
Washington	1982	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	76.9	30.0	21.7	47.0	23,702
	1972	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	83.8	11.0	25.1	48.0	10,178
West Virginia	1982	17.4	25.0	48.4	-1.4	23.0	–	–	–	–	–	74.8	29.0	17.3	19.5	14,948
	1972	18.8	20.0	43.4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	71.9	40.0	23.4	40.5	7,976
Wisconsin	1982	20.4	1.0	32.0	-0.3	1.5	–	–	–	–	–	83.4	7.0	17.2	17.5	20,062
	1972	20.7	4.0	40.7	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	88.1	5.0	19.6	8.5	10,370
Wyoming	1982	19.2	7.0	51.8	-1.4	23.0	–	–	–	–	–	78.3	14.0	15.0	1.5	20,438
	1972	20.6	6.0	53.8	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	83.1	14.0	18.5	2.0	9,215
U.S. average	1982	18.4	–	–	-0.7	–	893	–	–	-44.0	–	73.8	–	18.9	–	17,368
	1972	19.1	–	–	–	–	937	–	–	–	–	77.2	–	22.3	–	9,619

State Performance Outcomes, Resource Inputs, and Population Characteristics, 1972 and 1982[1]

RESOURCE INPUTS								POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS									
Average teacher salary	Federal funds as % of school revenues			Current expenditures per pupil		Expend. as % of income per capita		Per capita income		% poverty ages 5–17		Median years education of adults		Minority % of enrollment		Handicapped % of enrollment	
Rank[3] out of 51 (15)	% (17)	Rank[3] out of 51 (18)	State comp ed program[5] (19)	Expenditure $ (20)	Rank[3] out of 51 (21)	% (22)	Rank[3] out of 51 (23)	Income ($) (24)	Rank[3] out of 51 (25)	% (26)	Rank[3] out of 51 (27)	years (28)	Rank[3] out of 51 (29)	% (30)	Rank[3] out of 51[1] (31)	% (32)	Rank[3] 51 (33)
35.0	16.6	2.5	NO	1,835	46.5	21.2	32.0	8,649	48.0	23.1	3.5	12.2	45.0	37.0	13.0	9.5	20.0
42.0	18.3	3.0	–	543	50.0	15.9	50.0	3,423	49.0	29.5	4.0	10.8	43.0	34.5	7.0	–	–
1.0	9.5	22.5	NO	5,369	1.0	33.0	1.0	16,257	1.0	11.4	38.0	12.8	2.0	22.5	28.0	8.2	34.0
1.0	17.4	4.0	–	1,441	2.0	27.3	3.0	5,285	4.0	14.6	21.0	12.4	4.5	16.3	24.0	–	–
21.0	12.9	11.0	YES	2,305	26.0	22.7	21.0	10,173	33.0	15.8	17.0	12.6	15.5	29.8	18.0	9.3	23.0
14.0	8.4	23.5	–	911	22.0	21.3	17.0	4,285	30.0	17.5	18.0	12.3	10.5	27.2	13.0	–	–
49.0	16.6	2.5	NO	1,713	50.0	20.2	40.0	8,479	50.0	22.7	5.0	12.2	45.0	30.2	17.0	9.7	15.0
49.0	17.3	5.0	–	601	49.0	18.4	42.0	3,268	50.0	31.6	2.0	10.5	49.5	29.4	10.0	–	–
10.0	10.1	19.0	YES	2,427	22.0	19.3	46.0	12,567	5.0	14.2	22.0	12.7	6.5	45.9	6.0	8.0	38.0
3.5	6.1	36.5	–	932	20.0	18.4	41.0	5,062	10.0	12.1	26.0	12.4	4.5	27.6	12.0	–	–
17.0	5.9	45.5	NO	2,708	15.0	22.0	26.0	12,302	8.0	10.8	41.0	12.8	2.0	23.1	24.0	7.2	45.0
25.0	8.5	21.0	–	905	23.0	19.8	29.0	4,574	14.0	12.3	24.0	12.4	4.5	18.4	21.0	–	–
20.0	6.2	41.5	YES	2,683	17.0	19.5	45.0	13,748	3.0	10.4	44.0	12.6	15.5	23.0	25.0	11.2	3.0
15.0	3.1	49.5	–	1,110	7.0	20.3	21.0	5,464	2.0	7.2	51.0	12.2	18.0	13.0	29.0	–	–
16.0	11.3	13.0	NO	3,125	6.0	26.6	6.0	11,731	14.0	14.6	20.0	12.5	28.0	29.0	20.0	10.9	5.0
11.0	7.1	30.5	–	1,097	8.0	21.3	16.0	5,143	7.0	12.0	28.0	12.1	29.0	21.3	20.0	–	–
2.0	–	–	NO	3,441	3.0	23.6	18.0	14,550	2.0	26.3	2.0	12.7	6.5	96.4	1.0	1.6	51.0
5.0	14.1	8.0	–	1,063	11.0	18.7	39.0	5,670	1.0	23.2	12.0	12.2	18.0	95.5	1.0	–	–
32.0	10.3	17.0	YES	2,276	27.0	20.7	37.0	10,978	21.0	17.6	16.0	12.5	28.0	32.0	16.0	8.8	28.0
27.0	9.7	19.0	–	861	26.0	19.4	31.0	4,434	20.5	18.9	15.0	12.1	29.0	28.0	11.0	–	–
33.0	13.9	8.0	YES	1,721	49.0	18.0	49.0	9,583	37.0	20.4	9.0	12.2	45.0	37.2	12.0	9.8	14.0
43.0	10.8	15.0	–	788	37.0	20.0	23.0	3,931	36.0	24.4	9.0	10.8	43.0	33.7	8.0	–	–
4.0	15.8	5.0	YES	2,604	20.0	22.3	25.0	11,652	15.0	11.7	36.0	12.7	6.5	75.2	2.0	6.9	46.0
7.0	8.4	23.5	–	1,020	13.5	20.0	25.0	5,107	9.0	9.7	41.0	12.3	10.5	–	–	–	–
37.0	10.3	17.0	NO	1,878	44.0	20.8	35.0	9,029	43.0	13.4	26.0	12.6	15.5	6.6	45.0	7.6	40.0
46.0	12.2	12.0	–	732	39.0	18.7	40.0	3,906	37.0	12.0	28.0	12.3	10.5	4.5	44.0	–	–
11.0	7.1	35.5	YES	2,720	14.0	22.5	23.0	12,100	10.0	14.1	23.0	12.5	28.0	39.8	13.0	10.1	8.0
6.0	4.9	42.5	–	986	16.0	19.2	34.0	5,135	8.0	10.7	35.0	12.1	29.0	24.9	15.0	–	–
24.0	6.4	40.0	YES	2,008	39.0	20.0	41.0	10,021	35.0	11.0	39.0	12.4	37.5	17.3	31.0	8.3	33.0
19.0	5.4	39.5	–	837	34.0	19.3	32.0	4,329	28.0	9.0	45.0	12.1	29.0	11.3	30.0	–	–
27.0	6.1	43.5	NO	2,343	24.0	21.7	29.0	10,791	25.0	10.8	41.0	12.5	28.0	6.0	46.0	9.4	22.0
18.0	2.5	51.0	–	970	18.0	22.0	14.0	4,415	23.0	9.8	39.5	12.2	18.0	2.8	46.0	–	–
36.0	6.2	41.5	NO	2,251	29.0	19.1	47.0	11,765	13.0	10.7	43.0	12.6	15.5	17.2	32.0	8.9	27.0
36.0	6.8	32.5	–	854	30.0	18.8	38.0	4,549	15.0	11.5	30.5	12.3	10.5	10.3	31.0	–	–
31.0	16.0	4.0	NO	1,835	46.5	20.5	39.0	8,934	44.0	21.2	7.0	12.1	50.0	12.2	38.0	9.7	17.0
45.0	16.5	6.5	–	650	46.5	18.1	45.0	3,586	45.0	25.1	7.0	9.9	51.0	9.5	32.0	–	–
39.0	12.7	12.0	NO	2,002	40.5	19.6	44.0	10,231	32.0	23.1	3.5	12.2	45.0	43.4	7.0	8.7	30.0
29.0	12.5	10.0	–	867	26.0	24.8	5.0	3,489	48.0	30.1	3.0	10.8	43.0	41.0	5.0	–	–
46.0	9.0	24.0	NO	1,985	42.0	22.0	27.0	9,042	42.0	15.1	18.5	12.5	28.0	1.2	50.0	9.9	12.0
31.0	7.3	29.0	NO	793	36.0	21.4	15.0	3,707	42.0	14.2	22.0	12.1	29.0	0.7	49.0	–	–
12.0	8.2	31.0	YES	2,998	7.0	24.5	13.0	12,238	9.0	11.9	35.0	12.5	28.0	33.6	14.0	11.1	4.0
8.0	7.1	30.5	–	962	19.0	19.4	30.0	4,953	11.0	11.5	30.5	12.1	29.0	24.8	16.5	–	–
15.0	5.9	45.5	YES	2,964	10.0	24.5	12.0	12,088	11.0	12.3	33.0	12.6	15.5	15.4	33.0	11.4	2.0
23.0	4.7	44.0	–	1,020	13.5	20.8	19.0	4,948	12.0	8.4	49.0	12.2	18.0	6.5	38.0	–	–
3.0	7.0	37.5	YES	2,652	19.0	24.2	15.0	10,956	22.0	12.4	32.0	12.5	28.0	29.1	19.0	6.9	49.0
3.5	3.8	48.0	–	1,175	5.0	24.5	7.0	4,796	13.0	9.1	44.0	12.1	29.0	16.2	25.0	–	–
22.0	7.0	37.5	YES	2,698	16.0	24.1	16.0	11,175	19.0	9.5	48.0	12.6	15.5	7.6	43.5	9.1	25.0
10.0	4.5	45.5	–	1,134	6.0	25.6	4.0	4,434	20.5	9.5	42.0	12.2	18.0	2.8	45.0	–	–
51.0	24.3	1.0	NO	1,685	51.0	21.7	30.0	7,778	51.0	30.3	1.0	12.2	45.0	51.9	4.0	9.5	18.0
50.0	26.0	1.0	–	634	48.0	20.6	18.0	3,071	51.0	41.5	1.0	10.7	45.0	51.1	2.0	–	–
34.0	9.6	21.0	YES	2,197	31.0	21.6	31.0	10,170	34.0	14.0	24.5	12.4	37.5	20.7	29.0	10.3	6.0
30.0	6.8	32.5	–	845	33.0	19.9	27.0	4,241	32.0	14.8	20.0	11.8	39.0	16.9	22.0	–	–
28.0	9.8	20.0	NO	2,727	13.0	28.5	4.0	9,580	38.0	12.7	30.0	12.6	15.5	12.3	36.5	7.8	39.0
–	8.5	21.0	–	–	–	–	–	4,092	33.0	12.9	23.0	12.3	10.5	6.9	36.0	–	–
41.0	8.7	27.5	YES	2,445	21.0	22.9	20.0	10,883	29.0	11.6	37.0	12.6	15.5	12.3	36.5	10.0	11.0
44.0	6.4	34.0	–	856	29.0	19.2	35.0	4,469	19.0	12.0	28.0	12.2	18.0	8.1	34.0	–	–
18.0	7.2	34.0	NO	2,069	35.0	17.3	51.0	11,981	12.0	9.4	49.0	12.6	15.5	19.1	30.0	7.1	47.0
12.0	5.9	38.0	–	917	21.0	17.8	47.0	5,148	6.0	8.8	46.0	12.4	4.5	14.2	26.0	–	–
48.0	5.3	45.0	NO	2,256	28.0	21.0	33.0	10,729	27.0	8.9	50.0	12.6	15.5	1.8	49.0	6.5	50.0
32.0	5.0	41.0	–	847	32.0	19.0	28.0	4,256	31.0	7.7	50.0	12.2	18.0	0.9	48.0	–	–
14.0	6.1	43.5	YES	3,285	4.0	25.1	9.0	13,089	4.0	13.3	27.0	12.5	28.0	37.7	11.0	12.3	1.0
20.0	4.3	47.0	–	1,219	4.0	22.7	12.0	5,380	3.0	8.7	47.5	12.1	29.0	21.6	18.5	–	–
23.0	15.0	7.0	NO	2,178	33.0	23.7	17.0	9,190	40.0	21.7	6.0	12.6	15.5	57.2	3.0	8.1	36.0
34.0	18.5	2.0	–	849	31.0	23.8	9.0	3,599	44.0	26.3	8.0	12.2	18.0	47.3	3.0	–	–
7.0	7.1	35.5	YES	3,769	2.0	30.6	2.0	12,314	7.0	17.9	14.0	12.5	28.0	42.9	8.0	7.5	42.0
2.0	5.4	39.5	–	1,466	1.0	27.9	2.0	5,260	5.0	12.2	25.0	12.1	29.0	26.7	14.0	–	–
29.0	–	–	YES	2,033	36.0	22.5	24.0	9,044	41.0	17.8	15.0	12.2	45.0	32.4	15.0	9.5	19.0
37.0	11.7	13.0	–	995	43.0	18.3	43.0	3,789	39.0	24.0	11.0	10.8	47.0	30.8	9.0	–	–
40.0	11.0	15.0	NO	2,002	40.5	18.4	48.0	10,876	24.0	14.0	24.5	12.5	28.0	4.5	48.0	7.5	41.0
47.0	10.0	17.5	–	740	38.0	17.0	48.0	4,351	26.0	15.7	19.0	12.0	36.5	2.4	47.0	–	–
26.0	8.5	29.0	YES	2,321	25.0	21.7	28.0	10,677	30.0	12.2	34.0	12.4	37.5	22.3	27.5	9.8	13.0
26.0	6.2	35.0	–	971	25.0	19.3	33.0	4,505	17.0	9.8	39.5	12.1	28.0	14.0	27.0	–	–
43.0	13.6	9.0	NO	2,237	30.0	19.7	43.0	11,370	18.0	15.1	18.5	12.5	28.0	24.3	23.0	9.7	16.0
40.0	11.6	14.0	–	686	44.0	18.2	44.0	3,772	40.0	19.5	14.0	12.1	29.0	16.4	23.0	–	–
13.0	8.4	30.0	YES	3,130	5.0	30.3	3.0	10,335	31.0	10.8	41.0	12.7	6.5	9.3	41.0	8.1	35.0
21.0	4.5	45.5	–	979	17.0	22.5	13.0	4,346	27.0	10.3	37.0	12.3	10.5	4.6	43.0	–	–
19.0	8.9	25.5	YES	2,841	11.0	25.9	7.0	10,955	23.0	13.2	28.0	12.4	37.5	22.3	27.5	8.6	31.0
17.0	4.9	42.5	–	1,073	9.0	24.0	8.0	4,478	18.0	10.6	36.0	12.0	36.5	13.3	28.0	–	–
9.0	8.7	27.5	YES	2,996	9.0	27.9	5.0	10,723	28.0	12.6	31.0	12.3	41.0	11.7	39.0	10.0	9.0
10.0	7.8	26.0	–	1,023	12.0	28.1	10.0	4,429	22.0	11.0	34.0	11.5	41.0	5.1	41.0	–	–
44.0	–	–	NO	1,916	43.0	22.5	22.0	8,502	49.0	20.6	8.0	12.1	50.0	42.0	9.0	10.0	10.0
48.0	16.5	6.5	–	700	42.0	20.1	22.0	3,490	47.0	29.1	5.0	10.5	49.5	41.2	4.0	–	–
47.0	13.0	10.0	NO	2,016	37.0	20.9	34.0	9,686	36.0	19.4	11.0	12.5	28.0	11.4	40.0	7.2	40.0
41.0	10.0	17.5	–	796	35.0	20.4	20.0	3,893	38.0	18.3	18.0	12.1	29.0	5.4	40.0	–	–
45.0	15.6	6.0	NO	1,831	48.0	20.6	38.0	8,906	45.0	20.2	10.0	12.2	45.0	28.8	21.0	10.5	7.0
39.0	13.3	9.0	–	659	45.0	18.0	46.0	3,664	43.0	24.8	8.0	10.6	47.0	21.6	18.5	–	–
30.0	11.1	14.0	YES	2,012	38.0	17.6	50.0	11,419	17.0	18.4	12.0	12.4	37.5	48.0	5.0	8.1	37.0
35.0	8.5	21.0	–	650	46.5	18.3	49.0	3,991	34.0	21.5	13.0	11.6	40.0	38.0	8.0	–	–
25.0	8.1	32.0	YES	1,842	45.0	20.8	36.0	8,875	46.0	9.8	46.0	12.8	2.0	7.6	43.5	9.4	21.0
33.0	7.9	25.0	–	707	41.0	19.0	37.0	3,730	41.0	10.0	38.0	12.5	1.0	6.2	39.0	–	–
50.0	7.4	33.0	NO	2,365	23.0	24.9	10.0	9,507	38.0	13.0	29.0	12.6	15.5	1.1	51.0	8.8	29.0
38.0	6.1	38.5	–	1,232	3.0	31.2	1.0	3,947	35.0	11.4	32.0	12.2	18.0	0.5	50.0	–	–
42.0	10.3	17.0	NO	2,193	32.0	19.8	42.0	11,095	20.0	14.4	21.0	12.4	37.5	28.2	22.0	8.5	32.0
24.0	10.6	16.0	–	875	24.0	20.0	24.0	4,373	25.0	18.2	17.0	11.7	39.0	24.8	16.5	–	–
5.0	8.9	25.5	YES	2,679	18.0	27.2	19.0	11,280	16.0	10.5	45.0	12.7	6.5	15.0	34.0	7.3	44.0
13.0	7.7	27.0	–	886	27.0	19.1	36.0	4,525	16.0	9.3	43.0	12.4	4.5	7.0	35.0	–	–
38.0	9.5	22.5	NO	2,173	34.0	24.8	11.0	8,769	47.0	18.2	13.0	12.1	50.0	4.9	47.0	9.2	24.0
38.0	12.4	11.0	–	713	40.0	19.9	26.0	3,577	46.0	24.3	10.0	10.6	47.0	4.9	42.0	–	–
8.0	6.6	39.0	YES	2,750	12.0	25.6	8.0	10,774	26.0	9.5	47.0	12.5	28.0	14.2	35.0	7.3	43.0
9.0	3.1	49.5	–	1,089	10.0	24.9	6.0	4,314	26.0	8.7	47.5	12.1	29.0	5.7	37.0	–	–
6.0	5.5	47.0	NO	2,997	8.0	24.2	14.0	12,372	6.0	7.5	51.0	12.7	6.5	8.7	42.0	9.0	26.0
22.0	7.6	26.0	–	1,001	15.0	22.8	11.0	4,395	24.0	11.2	33.0	12.4	4.5	9.3	33.0	–	–
–	9.3	–	–	2,473	–	22.3	–	11,107	–	15.3	–	12.5	–	25.7	–	9.0	–
–	7.1	–	–	994	–	20.7	–	4,515	–	14.8	–	12.1	–	22.1	–	–	–

D84 R4800-2A

RAISING QUESTIONS
Reacting negatively to changes mandated by the new Job Training Partnership Act, the St. Louis School District has decided not to participate, and officials in other districts express concern about funding cuts and new performance standards.

See Page 10.

WORKING TOGETHER
A pilot program funded by the Ford Foundation is focusing on coordinating state resources and using them more effectively to train "at-risk" teen-agers—those least ready for the world of work.

See Page 15.

PUSHING REFORMS
Many chief state school officers are playing key roles in the movement to upgrade American education. Saul Cooperman, New Jersey's commissioner, talks about some of the problems and satisfactions of the job.

See Pages 8 and 9.

EDUCATION WEEK

American Education's Newspaper of Record Volume III, Number 18 · January 25, 1984

© 1984 Editorial Projects in Education

Where Lau *Began, Much Has Changed*

Languages, Law, and San Francisco

On Jan. 21, 1974, the U. S. Supreme Court handed down a ruling in the case of Lau *v.* Nichols *that set in motion far-reaching changes in the ways educators viewed and treated non-English-speaking students. This report, the second in a series, examines what transpired in the district where* Lau *began. (The full text of the* Lau *decision appears on page 14.)*

By Charlie Euchner

SAN FRANCISCO—A young graduate of the public-school system here, now a sophomore at the City College of San Francisco, has few memories of his first years of formal education. About all the student, who immigrated to this city from Hong Kong, recalls is that he felt isolated from other students because he could not speak English.

As the years passed, the student gradually learned English. He took Chinese lessons after school for several years, but quit in order to make his English classes a top priority. When he was not in school trying to understand what his English-speaking peers were saying, he watched television for hours on end, imitating the speech of the actors to eliminate his Chinese accent. "The shows on T.V. are more or less how the society speaks," he now says.

School officials offered to enroll him in classes for non-English-speaking students, the student recalls, but he told his mother that he would rather learn English without any bilingual instruction. "I said no, because [classmates] said, 'You're an E.S.L. [student]' and laughed at you."

The student, who plans to major in compu-

Continued on Page 12

CHARLIE EUCHNER

Pupils at the Jean Parker Elementary School in San Francisco demonstrate the concept of size in a Chinese bilingual-education class.

Civil-Rights Panel To Review Education Policies

By Tom Mirga

HUNT VALLEY, MD.—The newly reconstituted U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, following two days of often heated debate, opened the way last week for a reassessment of its existing policies on school desegregation, bilingual education, and a host of other education-related topics.

By a 6-to-2 vote, the commission agreed to review all policies adopted by its predecessor since 1957. "We have a clean slate," said the fact-finding agency's Republican chairman, Clarence M. Pendleton Jr., prior to the conclusion of the new commission's first meeting here in suburban Baltimore. "We do not consider ourselves bound by the policies approved by [the previous] commission."

Although it has no enforcement powers, the commission's recommendations are generally viewed as having had a profound effect on the policies of the executive and legislative branches of government. Equal opportunity in education has long been one of the commission's major areas of inquiry.

The original commission had been highly critical of President Reagan's civil-rights and budget policies, particularly as they related to education. It was replaced by the new body following an agreement between the Congress and the White House over the President's plan to replace some of its members with people whose views are more consistent with his own.

In what some observers predicted was a signal of things to come, a five-member block of commissioners appointed to the panel by President Reagan and Republican leaders in the Congress voted to reject the original commission's policy of support for racial quotas as a means to remedy past discrimination in hiring.

The new commission majority also agreed to undertake studies of affirmative action in higher education, mandatory and voluntary methods of student desegregation, and the possible role of bilingual-education programs in the increasing isolation of Hispanic students.

It also agreed to "insulate" the budgets of "social programs" from commission review.

The panel's apparent shift in direction was strongly criticized by Mary F. Berry and Blandina C. Ramirez, two holdovers from the original commission.

During a press conference after the meeting, Ms. Berry said that the commission "is now a lapdog, and not a watchdog, of the government that is run by people with closed minds."

"If the work of the commission is to become merely the expression of lay opinion on matters of civil rights unrooted in what is required by law or what makes sense

Continued on Page 11

Texas Board's Darwin Vote Said Misreported

By Anne Bridgman

Texas education officials said last week that the State Board of Education's rejection this month of two amendments to its guidelines for the adoption of biology textbooks had been misreported by the press.

The board's 14-8 vote defeated measures that would have required biology textbooks to stress the "testability" of theories of origin and to include lists of major contributors to biological science, including Charles Darwin.

But that vote, the officials said, in effect left the state's 1974 textbook proclamation unchanged, and thus did not imply the barring of Darwinian theory, as was nationally reported.

The state's 10-year-old rule requires that, if evolution is included in science textbooks, it must be taught as "only one of several explanations of the origins of humankind [in a manner] not detrimental to the other theories of origin"; textbooks that are adopted must print a disclaimer explaining that evolution is a theory, not a fact. Of the five biology textbooks adopted during the last biology adoption process in 1976, all include information on the theory of evolution, textbook-selection officials said.

"The vote has been misunderstood," ac-

Continued on Page 17

President's Approach To School Discipline Draws Criticism

By Cindy Currence

Responding to President Reagan's call for "good, old-fashioned discipline," educators said last week that they welcomed the attention to the problems of student behavior but that the President's proposed initiatives represent a "very, very narrow" approach to a complex phenomenon.

And some, like Mary H. Futrell, president of the National Education Association, accused the President of using the initiatives as "nothing more than a political gimmick at the start of a Presidential campaign."

She and others criticized Mr. Reagan for painting too grim a picture of the school-discipline situation, for failing to distinguish between routine disciplinary problems and crime in the schools, and for relying on statistics from a 1978 study that they say are outdated.

But many, like Phyllis Blaunstein, executive director of the National Association of State Boards of Education, also agreed that the President's initiatives "could not fail to help."

The initiatives, formally announced this month by Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell, include plans to:

- Conduct extensive research, sponsored

Continued on Page 16

IN SUMMARY

Stumping the State
Alabama's chief state school officer is holding hearings across the state to promote his plan to upgrade schools. **Story on Page 5.**

Boosting the Budget
Illinois's chief is seeking $3 billion for education next year, including $19.6 million for a master-teacher program. **Story on Page 5.**

Evenly Matched in California
Public-school students do as well academically as private-school students from similar backgrounds, a study finds. **Story on Page 6.**

A Chief Reflects
Saul Cooperman, New Jersey's commissioner of education, talks about his first year and a half on the job. **Interview on Page 9.**

New Program, New Problems
Some school districts are disturbed by requirements and funding cuts in the new federal job-training program. **Story on Page 10.**

'Ayes' on Sony
The U. S. Supreme Court's ruling permitting home video recording will not affect schools, say experts. **Story on Page 10.**

The 'Silent One'
Esther G. Buckley, the only teacher on the new civil-rights commission, suggests her views with her votes. **Story on Page 11.**

Help for 'At-Risk' Students
The Ford Foundation is funding a major demonstration project to coordinate efforts to deal with school dropouts. **Story on Page 15.**

Commentary	18 and 24	Letters	18
Databank	8	Marketplace	22
Deadlines	21	Media Column	16
Events	20	Special Education Column	17
Honors	20	Washington News	10

EDUCATION WEEK (ISSN 0277-4232) is published 42 times per year (weekly except for the first week in January, the last week in June, the month of July, the first two weeks in August, the last week in November, and the last week in December) by Editorial Projects in Education, Incorporated. Editorial and advertising sales offices are located at 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Suite 560, Washington, D.C. 20036. (202) 466-5190. Subscriptions: U.S. and Canada: $39.94 for 42 issues. Foreign: $85.94 (airmail) and $56.44 (surface mail) for 42 issues. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. **POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to EDUCATION WEEK, P.O. Box 1939, Marion, Ohio 43305. Volume III, Issue 18.

Main Editorial and Business Offices

Suite 560, 1333 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 466-5190

Subscription Problems:
Please call Rhonda Sucher
202-466-5190

New Subscriptions
and Changes of Address
Write to:
Post Office Box 1939
Marion, Ohio 43305

EDITOR
Ronald A. Wolk

EXECUTIVE EDITOR
Martha K. Matzke

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
Thomas Toch, Susan Walton

ASSISTANT EDITOR
Tom Mirga

STAFF WRITERS
Hope Aldrich, Anne Bridgman
Cindy Currence, Charlie Euchner,
Susan Foster, Sheppard Ranbom

MIDWESTERN BUREAU
Peggy Caldwell
Midwestern Editorial Office
Cleveland, Ohio
(216) 752-0438

COMMENTARY EDITOR
Alex Heard

SYSTEMS MANAGER
Anne Bridgman

EVENTS EDITOR & COPY EDITOR
Tricia Furniss

ART DIRECTOR
Beth L. Schlenoff

ASSISTANT ART DIRECTOR
Ann Rickerich

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS
Ann Rickerich
Pamela Winston

CIRCULATION MANAGER
Rhonda J. Sucher

ASSISTANT TO PUBLISHER
Jeff Ranbom

PUBLISHING CONSULTANT
Lawrence A. Durocher Jr.

BOOKKEEPER
Lorna Green

STUDENT INTERN
Pamela G. Pitt

DISPLAY ADVERTISING

East Coast and Midwest

Director
Leslie K. Hubbard
Suite 560
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/466-5190

ADVERTISING SALES
REPRESENTATIVE

West Coast, Oklahoma, and Texas

Joe Shere
1507 Bonnie Doone Terrace
Corona del Mar, California 92625
714/640-5689

Grants to help establish *Education Week* have been made by the following philanthropic foundations: Atlantic Richfield Foundation, Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, Cleveland Foundation, Denver Foundation, Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Exxon Education Foundation, Faye McBeath Foundation, Frost Foundation, George Gund Foundation, Hartford Foundation for Public Giving, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Kettering Family Fund, Esther A. and Joseph Klingenstein Fund, Lilly Endowment, William Penn Foundation, Permanent Charities Fund of Boston, Sid W. Richardson Foundation, Rhode Island Foundation, San Francisco Foundation, Shell Companies Foundation, Standard Oil of Ohio, The Tinker Foundation.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES
IN U.S. AND CANADA

One year (42 issues). . .$39.94. Outside the U. S. and Canada. . .$56.44 per year for surface mail and $85.94 per year for airmail. Send subscription correspondence to: Education Week, P.O. Box 1939, Marion, Ohio 43305.

Back issues are available at $2.00 each (first class postage pre-paid). Send order to: Back Issues, Education Week, Suite 560, 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

THE WEEK

FEDERAL

Family Experts Brief President At White House

President Reagan called 10 experts on family issues to the White House last week to hear their views on the subject.

First in a seminar and then over lunch, the experts, including Marie Winn, author of *Children Without Childhood*, and Michael Novak of the American Enterprise Institute, briefed the President on a range of developments that have affected the family, including poverty, the increasing divorce rate, and the baby boom of the post-World War II years.

"It was a diverse group of people, and we were basically getting topics on the board," Mr. Novak said of the meeting. "The discussion was wide-ranging."

The meeting was organized by Bruce Chapman, deputy assistant to the President and director of the White House office of planning and evaluation, as the fourth in a series of "Presidential roundtables."

The roundtables were initiated a year ago as a way of familiarizing the President with important issues of the day, according to Carolee Bush, who is on Mr. Chapman's staff.

STATES

Connecticut Begins Fellowship Program In Math and Science

A consortium of business and education leaders in Connecticut has announced the start-up of a fellowship program to develop a cadre of high-school teachers who will work with other teachers to improve mathematics and science education in their districts.

The training program will begin this summer at Wesleyan University with 12 mathematics and science teachers. Eventually, a minimum of 40 will be trained at the university during each year of the program.

The teaching fellows will receive a $2,000 stipend during the summer session and $1,500 for their work during the school year, as well as free tuition, room, and board during the summer session. Each fellow will earn six credits from the university's graduate liberal-studies program.

The program is being administered by the Project to Improve Mastery of Mathematics and Science, a four-year-old organization based at Wesleyan and supported by a number of the state's leading industries.

The program is supported by the Connecticut Department of Education, the General Electric Foundation, the university, the Connecticut Academy of Science and Engineering, and several corporations in the state.

New Teacher Plan Gains Endorsements In New Jersey

Saul Cooperman, New Jersey's commissioner of education, has won two endorsements for his controversial plan to rewrite the state's teacher-licensing laws.

Edward Bloustein, president of Rutgers University, New Jersey's state university, said last week in an interview that he "strongly supports" Mr. Cooperman's proposal to bring more talented college graduates into the state's teaching corps by abolishing the current requirement that all teachers earn an education degree. *(See interview with Mr. Cooperman on page 9.)*

"The emphasis [in the commissioner's proposal] on liberal arts in the training of elementary- and secondary-school teachers is very sound," he said.

The Rutgers University Council on Teacher Education, a committee of faculty members from the graduate school of education that is charged with overseeing the training of teachers at the university, also endorsed Mr. Cooperman's plan recently.

In a report, the council expressed its support for the three aspects of an alternative licensing plan that Mr. Cooperman has proposed.

Under the plan, a person would have to have a bachelor's degree with a minor in education, a passing grade on a subject-area test, and a satisfactory rating on a one-year internship in order to teach in the state.

The council expresses some concern over Mr. Cooperman's plan, though. For example, in its report it recommended that the internship be conducted in closer cooperation with colleges and universities, and it said Mr. Cooperman should expand its 18-credit minor in education to 24 credits.

But opposition to the commissioner's proposals has also come from the state's college campuses.

John A. Rocco, a professor of education at Rider College, and Mildred Barry Garvin, who is on the faculty of the Rutgers department of social work, have, as members of the New Jersey legislature, led efforts to block Mr. Cooperman's proposals.

Mr. Rocco, a member of the Assembly's education committee, has joined Ms. Garvin, chairman of the committee, in sponsoring legislation that would delay consideration of Mr. Cooperman's plan for a year.

The New Jersey Education Association has led lobbying efforts to defeat the commissioner's proposals.

Stanford Educators Oppose Withdrawal From UNESCO

Faculty members at Stanford University's School of Education have voted to express their "serious concern" over the Reagan Administration's decision to withdraw from the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

The faculty's motion of concern praises the work of UNESCO in the educational development of nations, notes that Stanford faculty members have been involved in UNESCO programs, and notes "both the importance and the difficulty of international collaboration in education." But while acknowledging "the efforts made and the problems encountered by the United States in its work with UNESCO," the resolution says the faculty sees "no viable alternative to UNESCO for developing and sustaining worldwide communication and collaboration in educational, scientific, and cultural pursuits across the many cleavages that divide today's world."

The motion was adopted by a 19-1 vote, with two abstentions.

Virginia State Board Decides To Retain Middle-Grade Sports

The Virginia Department of Education has backed off an interpretation of some state education regulations that would have forced many middle schools in the state to eliminate interscholastic sports programs for some students.

In revising the state's accreditation standards, a committee appointed two years ago by Superintendent S. John Davis held that 6th- and 7th-grade students should be considered elementary-school students even if they attend middle or junior-high schools.

Because state law does not permit elementary-level students to participate in interscholastic sports programs, the interpretation would

WASHINGTON

Educators Question J.T.P.A. Strategy

Schools Redirecting Programs To Comply

By Susan G. Foster

St. Louis school-district officials have decided not to accept money for youth programs under the federal Job Training Partnership Act because they would have been required to make significant—and, they said, harmful—changes in existing pre-employment and training efforts for their high-school students.

St. Louis may be only the first of a number of districts to reject or limit their involvement in the new training program. As a result of the program's reduced funding and tougher performance standards, district officials in several cities have begun questioning its direction and how well the schools will fare under the new restrictions.

Susan Katzman, supervisor for career education in St. Louis, said that if the district had agreed to make changes in the program, it would have "negated every concept we've been trying to sell."

For at least the past four years, according to Ms. Katzman, the school district has tried to provide students with broad-based pre-employment services with "a heavy curriculum infusion." This year, however, the district would have had to shift its emphasis and concentrate on finding private-sector jobs for at least 40 percent of the students once the classroom training had been completed.

Federal Guidelines

Under federal guidelines for the Job Training Partnership Act, which on Oct. 1 replaced the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, agencies that provide training programs for youths must have a job-placement rate of at least 41 percent; a "positive-termination" rate of at least 82 percent, which can be met if program participants are either employed, back in school, or in the armed forces; and an expense of no more than $4,900 per participant.

This year, the Reagan Administration has provided about $2.8 billion, to be spread out over a nine-month period, to state and territorial governments to support job-training programs for youths and adults. In October, when the program will begin operating on a full-year cycle, the same amount of money will be used to finance programs for about a million people, the Labor Department announced earlier this month. *(See related chart to the right.)*

Although many state and local officials are still in the process of implementing the new program, others have already contracted with local organizations and have established the program's training priorities. For the first time, local training organizations, including school districts, will be held accountable for the program's effectiveness in training disadvantaged youths for employment.

In Pittsburgh, school officials negotiated a $282,000 contract with the city to run a pre-employment training program for about 200 in-school youths. During the first week of the program, about 27 of the students dropped out, according to Fred A. Monaco, the district's career-development manager.

Until this year, according to Mr. Monaco, the district has been able to place students in jobs with nonprofit agencies and pay them with federal stipends. Now, he said, students must be placed in private-sector jobs because their wages are no longer subsidized.

The standards, Mr. Monaco contends, are "so restrictive as to what you can do [that] we're losing the kids." "We've had a lot of early dropouts," he explained, "because we don't have the work experience."

"We're trying to cooperate and we want [the program] to succeed," Mr. Monaco said. But if the program does not meet federal standards, he explained, the district, which is already struggling with a budget deficit, could end up absorbing some of the program costs.

Despite the problems with the program's concept, Mr. Monaco maintains that the the schools' relationship with the city, which is the local J.T.P.A. sponsor, "is excellent."

In New York City, school officials are limiting their recruitment efforts to high-school seniors who are not planning to go to college to increase their chances of meeting the placement standards, according to Michael Racanelli, assistant director for the district's work-experience program.

But with only about $150,000 in J.T.P.A. funds, Mr. Racanelli said, the

Continued on Page 15

States' Job Training Partnership Act Allotments, July 1984 to June 1985

State	Unemployment Rate	Title II-A Training Programs Allotment	Title II-B Summer Jobs Allotment	Title III-Dislocated Worker Program Allotment	Title III-Dislocated Worker Program Required Match
Alabama	14.3%	$45,718,867	$16,599,358	$4,079,060	$0.0
Alaska	10.2	4,702,878	1,775,415	296,493	237,194
Arizona	10.3	24,071,745	8,776,397	1,900,800	1,520,640
Arkansas	9.7	18,543,748	7,189,673	1,340,825	1,340,825
California	10.3	206,967,087	75,371,390	18,211,123	14,568,898
Colorado	8.0	19,964,704	7,285,204	1,603,294	1,603,294
Connecticut	6.8	16,990,435	8,311,427	1,383,095	1,383,095
Delaware	7.6	4,702,878	1,775,415	303,277	303,277
District of Columbia	10.8	6,164,813	6,746,288	541,283	433,026
Florida	8.9	68,059,421	24,927,300	5,521,134	5,521,134
Georgia	7.6	36,691,694	13,843,092	2,601,742	2,601,742
Hawaii	6.4	5,475,161	2,279,027	342,631	342,631
Idaho	10.3	7,899,117	2,885,806	635,620	508,496
Illinois	12.2	104,953,189	37,980,866	10,866,051	4,346,420
Indiana	11.3	46,838,441	17,450,907	4,810,706	2,886,424
Iowa	8.6	18,910,217	6,893,957	1,853,741	1,853,741
Kansas	6.4	11,914,392	4,465,938	924,805	924,805
Kentucky	11.2	32,658,550	11,933,738	2,680,337	1,608,202
Louisiana	12.1	37,972,870	13,877,463	3,088,379	1,853,027
Maine	8.9	8,039,947	3,282,930	637,866	637,866
Maryland	7.5	27,289,918	10,515,210	2,310,360	2,310,360
Massachusetts	7.1	36,182,469	16,839,184	2,902,123	2,902,123
Michigan	15.2	103,925,839	37,478,242	11,578,385	0.0
Minnesota	8.4	27,178,542	9,913,311	2,465,109	2,465,109
Mississippi	12.1	24,295,227	8,916,856	1,932,727	1,159,636
Missouri	9.7	36,008,001	13,959,367	3,242,489	3,242,489
Montana	8.7	6,016,550	2,207,122	457,198	457,198
Nebraska	6.2	7,707,682	3,147,874	574,908	574,908
Nevada	10.2	7,475,521	2,703,689	753,523	602,818
New Hampshire	6.4	5,194,295	1,898,617	374,280	374,280
New Jersey	8.5	49,504,570	21,762,233	4,503,918	4,503,918
New Mexico	10.2	11,408,864	4,193,889	818,114	654,491
New York	9.0	123,452,151	50,848,855	10,422,943	10,422,943
North Carolina	8.9	44,786,303	16,366,076	3,650,676	3,650,676
North Dakota	6.0	4,702,878	1,775,415	185,629	185,629
Ohio	12.9	102,687,464	37,111,204	11,438,077	4,575,231
Oklahoma	8.1	16,879,681	6,268,877	1,317,932	1,317,932
Oregon	10.8	24,002,603	8,713,064	2,350,768	1,880,614
Pennsylvania	12.3	102,848,422	37,306,913	10,823,137	4,329,255
Puerto Rico	23.6	60,360,805	22,269,883	3,391,510	0.0
Rhode Island	9.5	7,804,484	3,140,596	669,235	669,235
South Carolina	10.4	28,042,343	10,222,019	2,315,906	1,852,725
South Dakota	5.7	4,702,878	1,775,415	206,188	206,188
Tennessee	11.7	43,949,827	15,992,744	3,805,859	2,283,515
Texas	8.1	93,620,142	34,374,879	6,719,377	6,719,377
Utah	8.9	9,249,966	3,389,474	758,998	758,998
Vermont	7.0	4,702,878	1,775,415	225,398	225,398
Virginia	6.9	32,317,888	12,625,007	2,395,540	2,395,540
Washington	11.5	38,329,076	13,883,123	3,828,532	2,297,119
West Virginia	17.8	21,433,067	7,765,585	2,241,181	0.0
Wisconsin	10.9	43,147,634	15,599,138	4,260,996	3,408,797
Wyoming	8.9	4,702,878	1,775,415	263,359	263,359
American Samoa	0.0	350,026	55,003	31,038	0.0
Guam	0.0	1,457,238	670,830	129,217	0.0
Northern Marianas	0.0	125,000	25,730	11,084	0.0
Trust Territories	0.0	1,285,908	74,374	114,025	0.0
Virgin Islands	0.0	1,781,828	380,370	157,999	0.0
Native Americans	–	–	13,176,511	–	–
Undistributed	0.0	–	–	55,750,000	0.0
National Total	**10.1**	**1,886,151,000**	**724,549,000**	**223,000,000**	**111,164,598**

Source: U.S. Department of Labor

School Guidelines Not Affected By High Court's Video Ruling

By Thomas Toch

WASHINGTON—The Supreme Court ruled last week that it is legal to use video recorders to tape television programs for personal use, but legal experts said the decision will have little immediate effect on the use of such recorded material in the schools.

In a 5-to-4 decision, the Court held in *Sony Corporation of America* v. *Universal City Studios Inc.* that the noncommercial use of videotape recorders in the home does not violate federal copyright laws. Companies that make and sell the machines do not violate such laws either, the Court ruled.

After taking the uncommon step of holding two rounds of oral arguments in the case, the Justices overturned a federal appellate-court ruling that the Sony Corporation of America, the maker of the Betamax video recorder, infringed the copyrights owned by Universal City Studios and Walt Disney Productions by enabling home television viewers to record movies without paying royalties.

In its decision, written by Associate Justice John Paul Stevens, the Court noted that both sides in the case agreed that the primary use of home video recorders was "time-shifting," the recording of a program for later, more convenient viewing.

Such private, noncommercial use of the machines, Justice Stevens wrote, falls within the "fair-use" exception to the legal right to control the use of copyrighted material, outlined by Congress in the 1976 amendments to the federal copyright laws.

According to Thomas M. Gould, former general counsel of the International Communications Industry Association, which counts many school audio-visual instructors among its members, the Court's decision will have "no bearing at all" on rules governing the use of videotaped materials in the schools.

"Schools are considered public places" and so are covered under the *Sony* case, he said, adding that the legal use of video-recorded material in the schools is outlined in "fair-use" guidelines worked out by educators and representatives of the entertainment industry a few years ago.

Under these guidelines, Mr. Gould said, schools may make only limited use of taped television programs and must destroy the material within 45 days.

Gwendolyn H. Gregory, deputy general counsel of the National School Boards Association, said her organization will advise school officials to continue to adhere to the guidelines, but that the *Sony* case may in the future be interpreted to allow greater use of videotaped material by schools.

Joining Justice Stevens in the majority in the case were Chief Justice Warren E. Burger and Associate Justices William J. Brennan Jr., Sandra Day O'Connor, and Byron R. White.

Associate Justice Harry A. Blackmun wrote the minority opinion, and was joined by Associate Justices Thurgood Marshall, Lewis F. Powell Jr., and William H. Rehnquist.

HEARINGS

The following Congressional hearings of interest to those in the field of elementary and secondary education have been scheduled for upcoming months. Because times, places, and witnesses frequently change with little advance notice, it is advisable to check with the committees by telephone on or near the appointed dates.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Child nutrition. Jan. 26. Joint hearings with the Senate and House Agriculture Committees on the President's task force on hunger, which will also deal with the topic of child-nutrition and school-lunch programs. Contact: Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education (202) 225-4368.

IN FEDERAL AGENCIES

Child nutrition. The Food and Nutrition Service of the Agriculture Department announced, in the Jan. 16 *Federal Register*, the annual adjustments to the reimbursement rates for meals served in the Summer Food Service Program for children. The adjustments are effective Jan. 1, 1984. Contact: Stanley C. Garnett, Child Nutrition Division, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S.D.A., Alexandria, Va. 22302; (703) 756-3620.

Children's television. The Federal Communication Commission published, in the Jan. 13 *Federal Register*, a report and a policy statement on programming and advertising practices in children's television. The commission concludes that rules setting programming and advertising requirements are undesirable, but "recognizes the special obligations of broadcasters to serve the child audience." Contact: Freda Lippert Thyden, Mass Media Bureau (202) 632-7792; or Brian Fontes, Mass Media Bureau (202) 632-6302.

to these students."[*]

The critical question is, therefore, whether the regulations and guidelines promulgated by H.E.W. go beyond the authority of § 601. Last term, in *Mourning* v. *Family Publications Service Inc.*, 411 U. S. 356, 369, we held that the validity of a regulation promulgated under a general authorization provision such as § 602 of Title VII[*] "will be sustained so long as it is 'reasonably realted to the purposes of the enabling legislation.' *Thorpe* v. *Housing Authority of the City of Durham*, 393 U. S. 268, 280-281 (1969)." I think the guidelines here fairly meet that test. Moreover, in assessing the purposes of remedial legislation we have found that departmental regulations and "consistent administrative construction" are "entitled to great weight." *Trafficante* v. *Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.*, 401 U. S. 424, 433-434; *Udall* v. *Tallman*, 380 U. S. 1. The Department has reasonably and consistently interpreted § 601 to require affirmative remedial efforts to give special attention to linguistically deprived children.

For these reasons, I concur in the judgment of the Court.

CONCURRING OPINION: MR. BLACKMUN

MR. JUSTICE BLACKMUN, with whom the CHIEF JUSTICE joins, concurring in the result.

I join MR. JUSTICE STEWART'S opinion and thus I, too, concur in the result. Against the possibility that the Court's judgment may be interpreted too broadly, I stress the fact that the children with whom we are concerned here number about 1,800. This is a very substantial group that is being deprived of any meaningful schooling because they cannot understand the language of the classroom. We may only guess as to why they have had no exposure to English in their preschool years. Earlier generations of American ethnic groups have overcome the language barrier by earnest parental endeavor or by the hard fact of being pushed out of the family or community nest and into the realities of broader experience.

I merely wish to make plain that when, in another case, we are concerned with a very few youngsters, or with just a single child who speaks only German or Polish or Spanish or any language other than English, I would not regard today's decision, or the separate concurrence, as conclusive upon the issue whether the statute and the guideline require the funded school district to provide special instruction. For me, numbers are at the heart of this case and my concurrence is to be understood accordingly.

Foundation To Aid Joint Efforts for 'At Risk' Youths

By Susan G. Foster

To address the rising dropout rate among the state's high-school students, public and private agencies in Oregon have independently focused their efforts over the years on alternative-education and training programs for "at-risk" young people—those troubled teen-agers least ready for the world of work.

In Oregon, as in states across the nation, that population has been growing steadily. In 1972, according to statistics released this month by the U. S. Education Department, it ranked 26th among the states in its proportion of dropouts, with a rate of 20 percent; by 1982, its dropout rate had climbed to 28 percent and it ranked 35th among the states.

Now, however, Oregon officials are developing a new strategy that will focus more attention on such young people and target state resources more effectively to solve their job-training problems.

State leaders have decided to assume more responsibility for the development and administration of such programs, and officials from various public agencies and private organizations have committed themselves to work cooperatively to prevent duplication of services.

Because of its interest in that kind of statewide coordination, Oregon has been selected as one of three states to participate in a demonstration project, developed by Public/Private Ventures, a Philadelphia-based research and program-development firm, that will encourage interagency planning to provide education and training programs for "at-risk" youths, or those who are identified as potential dropouts.

The project, called State Employment Initiatives for Youth, will be supported over the next two years by a $1.4-million grant from the Ford Foundation. Training programs are to be created by pooling the resources and capabilities of a variety of state and private agencies, according to Thomas J. Smith, director of state programs for Public/Private Ventures.

Recent studies have suggested that employment and training programs for disadvantaged youths have been successful in dealing with record-high unemployment among teen-agers, which federal officials have called one the nation's most serious social problems.

The project, Mr. Smith said, is particularly timely because the new federal Job Training Partnership Act places heavy emphasis on the coordination of education and training efforts at state and local levels. "One of the big messages out of the [federal statute], other than states' new role, is that they have to coordinate education and job-training resources a lot better" than they did under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, he said.

The Ford Foundation, which has traditionally supported programs directed at disadvantaged youths and youth-employment problems, became interested in the project, according to Gordon Berlin, Ford's program officer, because it attempts "to encourage the states to design more rational and comprehensive systems" for serving young people.

"There was a lack of coordination previously in the employment and training community," Mr. Berlin asserted. Those involved in youth programs, he said, "tended to work in competing and separate areas, and what was needed was better coordinaation" in the development of a model system.

Under the model developed by Public/Private Ventures, Oregon, Massachusetts, and South Carolina are to establish youth-coordination councils to administer training programs. But before those programs begin, each state council will collect baseline data, ascertain the needs of the target population, and devise a strategy for meeting those needs. The council will also be responsible for setting program priorities and developing a process for identifying exemplary training programs.

By next November, the council will again conduct an assessment of its efforts and make any modifications it considers necessary. In March 1985, it will prepare for a second round of exemplary training programs, according to Mr. Smith.

Before the pilot program ends in January 1986, Mr. Smith explained, the research-and-development firm plans to disseminate the results of the demonstration program.

In working with the three states, Mr. Smith said, "we've tried not to be too specific because those are the kinds of decisions the states are going to have to make," and they will have to make them long after the pilot program has concluded. It is important that "we let them work out the practical problems," he added.

Another factor in the firm's decision to limit its role in the states' decisionmaking, according to Mr. Smith, is that "the states are making a significant contribution of their own money to the effort."

Each of the three states has agreed to commit between $400,000 and $500,000 toward the program. "The focus here is that the state is developing its own capacity to do more with what it already has," Mr. Smith explained.

More than 20 states were initially considered for the project, Mr. Smith said. But the states chosen were selected because of their interest, their perception of the problem at hand, and their ability to carry out the program's objectives, he explained.

In Massachusetts, state officials expect to produce a statewide policy on youth employment, according to Paul Osterman, director for planning, policy, and research for the Office of Economic Affairs. "There are an awful lot of people involved in youth employment in the state, and we're going to see if we can pull them all together," he said.

"I think this provides the spark to get it going," Mr. Osterman added.

Nita Crimins, director of job-development and training services for the Oregon Department of Education, which has been designated as the lead agency in the state's efforts, said that each of the 13 members on the council has previously been involved in programs for the targeted population. But as representatives of various groups, "we are becoming more closely linked," she said.

"We're not trying to create new programs," Ms. Crimins explained. "We're taking a look at existing programs and making them work better."

Schools Question J.T.P.A. Strategy

Continued from Page 10

program will consist of hiring staff to provide training for about 300 students. "It's not that it can't be done," he added, it's that "the task is just more difficult."

Thomas Peters, coordinator of youth-employment programs for the Chicago Public Schools, said school officials had expected program changes but they did not forsee the extent of those changes.

This year, the district will receive up to $443,000 to provide one week of inservice training for about 475 students; under the terms of the arrangement, officials must find jobs for about 350 students. Last year, the school district received roughly $1 million to administer an in-school job-training program for students.

The St. Louis school district, according to Ms. Katzman, could have focused its program on training for high-school seniors.

But that would have put their program directly in competition with another program that is currently operating in the schools, called "Jobs for Missouri's Graduates," she said.

"I feel strongly about not competing with groups that work with seniors," Ms. Katzman added. "To me, it didn't make sense to duplicate services to the same kids."

For now, Ms. Katzman explained, the St. Louis school board has agreed to support the district's career-exploration and transitional-services program. "We've fared a little better [than some other districts] because our program has not been based on work experience, which would mean stipends and people to supervise," she said.

Despite the decision not to run an in-school program, the district is hoping to secure future J.T.P.A. funds if the federal guidlines are relaxed once a track record has been established, according to Ms. Katzman.

The St. Louis program attempts to teach students about the need for good work habits early. "Where placement fits in," the official added, "is almost icing on the cake if you're going to teach kids to be productive workers, college students, or military personnel."

MAKING THE TRANSITION TO SCHOOL A SUCCESS THROUGH EFFECTIVE KINDERGARTEN SCREENING
AN INTENSIVE PLANNING CONFERENCE
sponsored by
Gesell Institute of Human Development
Learn why 74 schools in Broward County (Ft. Lauderdale area)
Half of the schools in Brevard County (Kennedy Center area)
Thousands of public, private, parochial schools nationwide have chosen the Gesell Institute approach
Hilton Inn, Orlando, Florida
February 8–10, 1984
Gesell Institute of Human Development
310 Prospect Street, New Haven, CT 06511
For more information, call (203) 776-8125

The 1984 National Conference on . . .
MERIT PAY FOR TEACHERS
New perspectives, experiences, and strategies for evaluating, developing, and implementing a successful merit pay system.
For school superintendents and staff, school board members, and evaluators.
SARASOTA, FLORIDA
March 22 & 23, 1984
Sponsored as an educational service to the public and private elementary and secondary school systems by:
The American Center for Management Development
America's largest and most respected management development center
–and–
Florida Atlantic University
College of Business and Public Administration
The State University at Boca Raton
These nationally recognized experts will lead the 1984 conference:
Ronald A. Berk, Johns Hopkins University – *School of Education*
H. John Bernardin, Florida Atlantic University – *Administrative Systems Center*
Susan Moore Johnson, Harvard University – *Graduate School Of Education*
Jeffrey S. Kane, University of Massachusetts – *School of Management*
Edward E. Lawler, III, University of Southern California School of Business – *Center for Effective Organizations*
David B. Lipsky, Cornell University – *School of Industrial Relations*
Lyman Porter, University of California–Irvine – *Graduate School of Management*
To register, call 813-371-6666
or write to:
The Registrar · The American Center
P.O. Box 21179 · Sarasota, Fla. · 33583